

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 20, 1937.

The eighth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1937 was held in its office in the Navy Department Building on Saturday, March 20, 1937. The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Clarke,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Borie,
Mr. Shepley,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr. Manship,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Executive Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting held February 18, 1937, were approved.

2. GETTYSBURG MEMORIAL COIN: Under date of March 15th Hon. Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint, sent the following letter to the Commission:

I am submitting photographs of a model for the coin authorized by Congress to be issued in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

The photographs are submitted for your consideration as to their artistic merits.

The Executive Secretary of the Pennsylvania Commission has stated that the suggestion has been made to the sculptor that he give a little further study to the letter "R" and that the insignia on the Confederate Soldier's collar be removed."

The models were made by Frank Vittor, of Pittsburgh. The photographs were submitted to Mr. Manship for criticism.

Mr. Manship stated that he was not especially enthusiastic about the appearance of the models as shown in the photographs but thought they did look quite competent. On the one side there are two portraits, one representing a Union and the other a Confederate soldier; they are identical

even to the expression of the eyes, excepting that the Confederate soldier has a beard, wears the large Confederate hat and has insignia on his collar. The reverse shows the shield of the Union and the flag of the Confederate States with the emblem of fasces, around the base of which on the one side are oak leaves and on the other laurel. Mr. Manship questioned the use of fasces in this case and also was of the opinion that the pine tree was symbolical of the South.

Mr. Moore felt that the fasces could remain as a symbol of the Union of the states and said that he has seen the laurel used to symbolize the South. It was also pointed out that possibly the two faces are alike to indicate that they were brothers.

As for the criticisms of the Pennsylvania Commission, Mr. Manship said he found no fault with the R, though the insignia on the Confederate soldier's collar might be removed. Also since there are no stars on the shield of the United States, those in the design should be removed.

The Commission approved the models subject to the above criticisms, which were embodied in a report sent to the Director of the Mint. (Exhibit A)

3. GENERAL ARTEMAS WARD STATUE: Mr. Moore stated that it was expected last fall that the General Artemas Ward statue would be dedicated this spring, but that the sculptor, Mr. Leonard Crunelle, has been delayed in the completion of the work as is shown in the following letter received from him:

March 4, 1937.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Once more I am obliged to say that the Artemas Ward figure is not yet finished. I must be frank and explain what has been

the trouble. Long ago when about ready to cast, I realized that the figure could be made finer and at the last minute tried to make some improvement in the work. This led to other changes and although the pose and general arrangement of the cloak is the same as before, I have worked over the whole figure. I have made numerous heads in an effort to have a resemblance and yet have the type conventionalized.

Every time the work was about ready to cast I would have misgivings and could not bring myself to stop. Perhaps I tried to do better than I knew how. I assure you it has not been through neglect that this has not been finished long ago. All I can say is that the figure is greatly improved and will be ready to cast in three weeks.

A severe illness forced me to spend considerable time in the hospital and upset my plans for completion of the monument. I am still under the doctor's care but working every day.

Thank you for having been so patient with me,

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Leonard Crunelle.

Mr. Charles Moore,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

The Commission agreed with Mr. Moore that the sculptor should submit a photograph of the finally completed model before he casts the statue.

4. FLEET MARINE CORPS RESERVE MEDAL: A letter dated March 17, 1937, was received from Major General Thomas Holcomb, Commandant of the U. S. Marine Corps, as follows:

17 March 1937.

From: The Major General Commandant.
To : The National Commission of Fine Art.
Subject: Service Medal for personnel of the Fleet
Marine Corps Reserve.
Enclosures: (3).

1. In accordance with the Executive order dated 28 July 1921, relating to design of medals, insignia, etc., there is

submitted herewith for advice as to the merits of the design of a proposed medal which has been recommended to be awarded personnel of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, for long and honorable service.

2. Enclosed herewith is a letter which was submitted recommending the adoption of a suitable medal to be awarded for service in the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve. The proposal to award a suitable medal indicative of long and honorable service in the Marine Corps Reserve is approved. The name of the medal and the rules and regulations governing its award will be determined later.

3. The return of enclosures is requested.

(Signed) T. Holcomb

The Secretary said that he had been informed that the design was made at the U. S. Mint in Philadelphia, and was doubtless the work of John R. Sinnock, Chief Engraver.

Mr. Manship inspected the design and suggested that a model be made of it for further consideration by the Commission. A report was sent to Major General Holcomb accordingly. (Exhibit B)

5. THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL: Hon. John J. Boylan, Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, having submitted the designs for the Memorial by Mr. John Russell Pope, architect, arrangements were made for a joint session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to consider them. Most of the day was devoted to the consideration of the project, since it involves not only the memorial proper, but also the treatment of the area south of the Washington Monument, as contemplated in the Plan of 1901. At 10 o'clock the members of both Commissions and also Hon. Hollins N. Randolph, representing Congressman Boylan and Mr. Pope, inspected the 1901 Model of the "Future Washington" and also a model of the Jefferson Memorial Composition as designed by Mr. Pope. After inspection of the models the two Commissions convened in the conference room of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for discussion. The record of the discussion is attached to these

Minutes and is made a part thereof.

The design submitted by Mr. Pope, which called for a pantheon type of memorial, was not approved. Both Commissions decided that before further action is taken in the matter a landscape plan must be prepared for the treatment of the entire area south of the Washington Monument and west of Fifteenth Street and that a careful study should be made of the estimate of cost so that the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission and Congress may be fully informed as to the cost both of the memorial proper and of the landscape treatment of the grounds, including roadways, changes in the Tidal Basin, and relocation of trees. Each Commission decided to report individually to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission. A copy of the proceedings of the day and draft of letter concerning the Thomas Jefferson Memorial were sent to each member of the Commission of Fine Arts and made a part of these minutes.

6. NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART: The Commission discussed with Mr. Pope and the members of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission a location plan he submitted with memorandum as follows:

Accompanying plan shows the relationship of the National Gallery and the National Museum.

To avoid monotony in appearance the Constitution Avenue and Mall facades, which are approximately 829 feet in length are treated with projections and recesses rather than in a straight line.

On the Mall side the greatest projection of the building is the same distance from the curb as the greatest projection of the National Museum, namely 77'8 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". The face of the main facade on the Mall which is 66% of the total length of the building is however 146' from the curb as compared with 100' from the curb of the main facade of the National Museum.

The main facade on the Constitution Avenue side which is 66% of its total length is approximately 145' from the curb as

compared with approximately 109' in the case of the National Museum.

The central projection of the National Museum is 84'11" from the Constitution Avenue curb. Our maximum projection at West end of the Gallery is approximately 84' and 74' at East end, both projections being on a line with that of the Main Facade of the National Museum and the maximum projection of 74' being that of the set back of the Triangle Group.

JOHN RUSSELL POPE
542 Fifth Avenue, N. Y.

February 26th, 1937

Members of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission pointed out that the Mall Plan providing for a 100 foot building line has the force of law and that in their opinion no change should be made in the established building line; however, it was agreed that Mr. Pope could extend his building 10 feet nearer to Constitution Avenue on the west end of the building, so that the gallery and apex building would be equally 74 feet from the curb on Constitution Avenue.

Later in the day the Commission of Fine Arts adopted the following resolution drafted by Mr. Clarke:

The National Gallery shall be kept 100 feet distant from the north curb of the North Mall Drive and a minimum of 74 feet distant from the south curb of Constitution Avenue opposite the center of the Apex Building. The building shall be built parallel to the Mall.

Mr. Clarke presented his views as to certain details in a letter sent to Mr. Moore dated March 15, 1937 (Exhibit C)

It was decided to hold a meeting in the very near future for a discussion with Mr. Pope as to details of the plans for the National Gallery of Art.

The Commission adjourned at 5:30 p. m.

C O P Y

March 24, 1937.

My dear Mrs. Ross:

The Commission of Fine Arts received your letter of March 15, inclosing photographs of models for the coin authorized by Congress to be issued in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg. The photographs were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Paul Manship, sculptor member of the Commission of Fine Arts, for criticism.

Mr. Manship reported at the meeting of the Commission on March 20th that in general he considered the models satisfactory. He called attention to the fact that the faces and expression of the eyes of the two soldiers are nearly identical but was aware that the artist may have done this intentionally. The stars should be removed from the United States Shield to make it conform to the Great Seal. Such is the common usage. Mr. Manship thought the letter R would not require further change, but that the insignia on the Confederate soldier's collar might be removed. Subject to these suggestions the Commission approve the models.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Hon. Nellie Tayloe Ross,
Director of the Mint,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT A

C O P Y

March 22, 1937.

Dear General Holcomb:

The design for the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve Medal, which you submitted with your letter of March 17, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 20, 1937. The design was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Paul Manship, sculptor member of the Commission.

According to the suggestion of Mr. Manship the Commission of Fine Arts respectfully request that the artist submit a small model of this design, which is herewith returned. The model will show whether it is possible to carry out the design of the artist.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Major General Thomas Holcomb,
U. S. Marine Corps,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

March 15, 1937.

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Navy Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Since floor plans for the National Gallery were sent to the members of the Commission, I take the liberty of setting forth my comments, not, however, without a full knowledge of my own limitations as a critic of architectural problems. I would prefer that the statements I have set down be considered as coming from a layman, one deeply interested in problems of this particular kind stimulated through a more than common interest in art and a fairly wide layman's acquaintance with galleries in America and abroad.

In previous communications, I have expressed my opposition to (a) the dome, (b) the design of the central composition of this building, which I have expressed elsewhere as a "Jefferson Memorial with wings", and (c) the fact that the structure extends a considerable distance beyond the setback line previously established jointly by the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The following comments with respect to the plan are submitted with the hope that they may be freely discussed at a meeting of the Commission:

(a) Garden Courts. It is my understanding that it is Mr. Pope's intention to provide covered courts, which would require exotic plant materials. In my opinion, these courts might better be left open to the sky that they may be planted with materials which grow out-of-doors as in the Freer Gallery. Such a treatment would provide infinitely greater charm and provide cool, shaded retreats in summer, which the green house treatment would not.

(b) Stairways. The omission of a monumental stairway seems to me to be most unwise. The entrance foyer would possess a greater dignity and provide the visitor a greater feeling of "something beyond", which a closed foyer does not. I venture to say that the large majority of visitors would prefer to walk up one flight rather than take an elevator the short distance necessary to reach the exhibition floor. The greater feeling of openness is the best reason, however, for keeping a grand stairway in full view rather than hiding two service stairs in wells.

(c) Skylights are known to be troublesome features to maintain in all buildings in which they have been installed. Modern artificial lighting has been developed to a point where it is no longer experimental. The works of the Masters might then be viewed in perfection at all times. Since I assume that air conditioning of the building is necessary, on account of the heat of Washington's summer climate, modern artificial lighting will provide perfection made possible by modern invention and the potential troubles with skylights will be forever eliminated.

(d) Gallery Lighting. Last week, I visited Yale University and was again privileged to spend some time with Dean Meeks. After some time in the Yale Gallery, the Dean explained the importance of having galleries with natural side lighting for the display of small paintings, which should be viewed more intimately. No provision has been made for such a gallery or galleries in so far as I am able to ascertain from the plans.

Cordially and sincerely,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke.

10:30 a. m., Saturday, March 20, 1937.

Thomas Jefferson Memorial:

MR. CAMMERER: This is a joint meeting of the Fine Arts Commission and the Park and Planning Commission, and the procedure will be that we will have a round table discussion with MR. POPE and his associates, and after that we will go into executive session. Would you like to start the discussion MR. MOORE?

DR. MOORE: I think we should hear from MR. RANDOLPH, who is representing the Jefferson Commission.

MR. RANDOLPH: CONG. BOYLAN is the Chairman of the Jefferson Memorial Commission and illness prevented his being here today. He requested me to be here and substitute for him. We want first to express our appreciation of the invitation extended by you gentlemen to be present this morning, these two Commissions representing those two important Government bodies so vitally concerned with the matter in hand. The Commission of which I am a member, charged with the responsibility by Congress, went ahead after due deliberation, decided upon the site, that you know about, and also selected the site, that you know about, and also selected MR. POPE as our architect to draw suitable designs, which in time he did, and after more than a year of consideration those designs were adopted and accepted as being suitable for the purposes for which the Commission was created. I might say so far as our particular duties are concerned, we have selected the site, architect and design after full consultation with the President. We recognize that whatever design is decided upon by our Commission has to be arranged to conform as near as may be possible with the local conditions existing on that site. We conceived that there were three things to be taken into consideration in connection with the work we were charged to do. The first was to

Jefferson Memorial

Mr. Chairman: This is a brief history of the Jefferson Memorial

and the staff and Planning Commission, and the procedure will be that we will

have a round table discussion with Mr. ROY and his associates, and after

that we will go into executive session. Would you like to start the dis-

cussion Mr. ROY?

Mr. ROY: I think we should hear from Mr. ROY, who is repre-

senting the Jefferson Memorial.

Mr. RALPH: CONG. RALPH is the Chairman of the Jefferson Memorial

Commission and illness prevented his being here today. He requested me to

act as his substitute for him. We want first to express our appreciation

of the invitation extended by you gentlemen to be present this morning.

There are two commissions responsible for the important Government bodies so

called, one of which is the Commission of which I am a

member, (which) with the responsibility of Congress, went ahead after the

liberation, decided upon the site, that you know about, and also a

site, that you know about, and also selected Mr. ROY as our architect to

draw suitable designs, which in time he did, and after more than a year of

consideration those designs were adopted and accepted as being suitable for

the purpose for which the Memorial was intended. I might say so far

as particular duties are concerned, we have selected the site, architect

design after full consultation with the President. We recognize that

after design is decided upon by our Commission has to be arranged to com-

plete as near as may be possible with the local conditions existing on that

site. We conceived that there were three things to be taken into considera-

tion in connection with the site, the design, and the construction.

satisfy the people; second, to give due and proper consideration to the character memorialized--having something suitable and in keeping with his life and ideals, and third, to conform with plans of the governmental agencies created by the people through Congress in order that the monument when constructed would be in keeping with the plan of Washington and with other structures already erected or which may hereafter be erected. With those three things done, I am sure the job will be done correctly. It has been a great pleasure to this particular Commission to immediately get into conference with and cooperate to the fullest extent with the two bodies then existing, the Fine Arts Commission and with the Park and Planning Commission. The act of creation of this Commission provided that the Commission itself would undertake the construction or erection of the Memorial agreed upon, after conforming with the existing situation which I have briefly referred to. All that might be done through contacts with governmental agencies interested has been done. You will understand that practically every member of this Commission were business men, professional men, laymen in various endeavors of life, and so we have to rely as to those important features on those who know. We selected a Government agency who had charge of the construction or erection of the memorial if, as and when finally agreed upon. After conference with the President and others, the National Park Service was selected as the agency to fulfill that duty. Of course in all things of worthwhile moment in the affairs of men and in life, respect has to be given to fundamental differences in opinion. Human nature is so constituted that we cannot look through the same glasses and see the same things. Due regard has been given in this instance to differences of that sort. No one should be surprised or disappointed because the other fellow won't always agree. There is another principle in life of equal importance and that is

that it is always possible to advance things notwithstanding differences of opinion. I am sure that will be the case here, and when this work of art is completed, it will be, I am sure, a worthy addition to what is already within the confines of Washington, and so I shall end my remarks with a statement of renewal of my appreciation of my opportunity to be with you and learn something about the details. I have nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMMERER: I would like to add a little more information. Early in the deliberations of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, they consulted with MR. DELANO and they asked him to appear before them relative to the site. MR. DELANO was ill and I appeared before the Committee in his place, and I pointed out various sites. I pointed out that that memorial might take the shape of an \$80,000 memorial, or it might be two or three million. In St. Louis there is planned a memorial that may run to \$30,000,000, and for which we have \$9,000,000 in hand to acquire the land in 36 city blocks. I pointed out to them that a site that was always considered for a memorial of great importance in the city of Washington was the site on the south axis of the White House which today had some engineering difficulties to be considered. I pointed out several more. I pointed out a site in Lincoln Park, and the site where the Apex Building now stands, and before the Apex Building was constructed, we had cleared through the Park and Planning Commission that site for memorial purposes. Another site I suggested was opposite the Archives Building, and another one in Anacostia Park, and we did not go into the question of selecting an available site for minor memorials in the city. Later on this Act was passed which left it to this Commission to determine upon a site (read from Act). I believe the Commission has authorized a contract with MR. FOTE for this memorial. Funds have not yet been appropriated by Congress for beginning construction. We did, with the approval of the Commission, make some boring

As it is now, it is a very fine site, and when this work of art is completed, it will be, I am sure, a worthy addition to what is already within the confines of Washington, and so I shall end my remarks with a statement of renewal of my appreciation of my opportunity to be with you and learn something about the details. I have nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMMERER: I would like to add a little more information. Early in the deliberations of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, they consulted with Mr. DELANO and they asked him to appear before them relative to the site. Mr. DELANO was ill and I appeared before the Committee in his place, and I

shape of an \$80,000 memorial, or it might be two or three million. In fact, there is planned a memorial that may run to \$30,000,000, and for which we have \$9,000,000 in hand to acquire the land in 35 city blocks. I pointed out to them that a site that was always considered for a memorial of great importance in the city of Washington was the site on the south axis of the White House which today had some engineering difficulties to be considered. I pointed out several more. I pointed out a site in Lincoln Park, and the site where the Apex Building now stands, and before the Apex Building was constructed, we had cleared through the Park and Planning Commission that site for memorial purposes. Another site I suggested was opposite the Archives Building, and another one in Anacostia Park, and we did not go into the question of selecting an available site for minor memorials in the city. Later on this Act was passed which left it to this Commission to determine upon a site (read from Act). I believe the Commission has authorized a contract with Mr. ROSE for this memorial. Funds have not yet been appropriated by Congress for beginning construction. We did, with the approval of the Commission, make some boring

tests. Those borings were of course necessary under any condition. The Memorial Commission was kind enough to ask MR. DELANO and me to come up and view the plans prepared by MR. POPE, but the two Commissions, the Fine Arts Commission and the Park and Planning Commission, as such, have never had the opportunity to study them. I believe there are some things both Commissions would like to discuss, and we will make a report to your body at the proper time. MR. POPE, would you like to make a statement?

MR. POPE: I have prepared designs for various sites. I was asked by the Commission to prepare a design of a memorial on the south axis of the White House at a cost of \$3,000,000. I told the Jefferson Memorial Commission that fundamentally I would adhere as closely as possible to all the suggestions and forms indicated in the Plan of 1901, and that the design of the building would be as near to the design considered at that time to be suitable for that site. I have done that, except that there are certain modifications that have come in as to the propriety of the memorial to the man. The design was presented and favorably received. Several questions came up. First, we cannot hurt the Lincoln Memorial. A careful study was made of the relation in size of the proposed memorial to Jefferson and the Lincoln Memorial, and it was felt and we found that that relationship was so * * that it did not hurt the Lincoln Memorial in any way. I might call attention to the drawing prepared, on that wall, that might create a wrong impression to your Commission or any commission. When the relationship of these two memorials was considered, the size and bulk of the memorial suggested for Jefferson and arrived at with the approval of my Commission was very much smaller, about 30 feet, if you can call that very much smaller, in size than the Lincoln Memorial. It was smaller visually, so I felt in order to maintain a dignity required for the purpose and location it was necessary to build that memorial up on a set base. The height of that base when made low, the memorial was inadequate to the

tests. Those borings were of course necessary under any condition. The Memorial Commission was kind enough to ask Mr. DUBOIS and me to come up and view the site. I think that was the first time we went there. The Commission and the Park and Planning Commission, as such, have never had the opportunity to study them. I believe there are some things both Commissions would like to discuss, and we will make a report to your body at the proper time. MR. BOPE, would you like to make a statement?

MR. BOPE: I have prepared designs for various sites. I was asked by the Commission to prepare a design of a memorial on the south axis of the White House at a cost of \$3,000,000. I told the Jefferson Memorial Commission that fundamentally I would adhere as closely as possible to all the suggestions and forms indicated in the Plan of 1901, and that the design of the building would be as near to the design considered at that time to be suitable for the site. I have done that, except that there are certain modifications that have come in as to the propriety of the memorial to the man. The design was presented and favorably received. Several questions came up. First, we asked about the Lincoln Memorial. A careful study was made of the relation in size of the proposed memorial to Jefferson and the Lincoln Memorial, and it was felt and we found that that relationship was so * * * that it did not hurt the Lincoln Memorial in any way. I might call attention to the drawing prepared, on that wall, that might create a wrong impression to your Commission or any other body. When the relationship of these two memorials was considered, the size and bulk of the memorial suggested for Jefferson and arrived at with the approval of my Commission was very much smaller, about 30 feet, if you can call that very much smaller, in size than the Lincoln Memorial. It was smaller visually, so I felt in order to maintain a dignity required for the purpose and location it was necessary to build that memorial up on a pedestal. The height of that base when made low, the memorial was indistinguishable to the

memorial called for in the plan of 1901. I finally arrived at a height of high water level at exactly the same level as the land at the base of the column of the Jefferson Memorial would be exactly the same as the base of the Lincoln Memorial. The drawings here show this relationship. In our case the road is lower because it is a modification of the plan of 1901 and which I preferred to submit to the Planning Commission before it was accepted. I do not believe outside of the fact that the design in addition to being similar to that suggested by the plan of 1901 * * * That about finishes all I have to say. I will be glad to answer any questions. I have some data here and will be glad to pass it around for any questions I can answer about it.

MR. CAMMERER: As Executive Officer of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, I have no further functions than to follow the instructions of that Commission. As far as I understand, there have been no questions raised regarding the site. I have not yet heard any objections to the site as such. I suppose we can go ahead with the understanding that the site has been selected.

MR. ELIOT: Speaking for MR. DELANO, he believes the location of the site should be included in the study of the design for the memorial.

MR. RANDOLPH: Perhaps it would be proper to say that the bill of rights or authority with the creation of the Jefferson Memorial Commission gave the responsibility for the selection of the site, selection of the design to the Commission, and they proceeded accordingly and were unanimous in their decision. They voted unanimously on the site and design.

MR. CAMMERER: DR. MOORE, the meeting is now open to discussion.

DR. MOORE: I think any questions that any member of these two Commissions may want to ask MR. POPE is now in order.

MR. POPE: I am sure some of you have some questions and I would like to be asked some questions.

MR. SHEPLEY: Did you devote any time to the question of the lighting of the memorial?

MR. POPE: No, that is a question I am going to depend on the advice of the Fine Arts Commission for. Two suggestions have been made, one for top lights and one for side lighting. I think it is a subject that is a little far ahead to talk about now. However that question as well as any other question that involves design is going to come to this Commission through the Jefferson Memorial Commission and through me.

MR. CAMMERER: Our Commission has as members Gen. Markham, Chief of Engineers, and COL. SULTAN, Engineer Commissioner for the District of Columbia. One of the problems discussed in connection with this memorial is the possibility of flushing of the Tidal Basin and Washington Channel. COL. HANNUM, do you wish to bring up any points on that.

COL. HANNUM: There is considerable agitation at this time for the elimination of pollution of the various rivers around Washington. The Tidal Basin as built now was built for the purpose of flushing the channel of the Washington waterfront. It has worked quite favorably. Whether it is probable that this plan as proposed may still permit that to be carried out, it will involve a considerable increase in cost. I don't know whether the District Engineer's office made a study of that or not. Before you determine what should be done to accomplish that, we are in a position to test the model at the Vicksburg laboratory. I notice that the area of the water surface has been increased so as to keep the apparent water area that exists at the present time***

MR. POPE: and to maintain practically the same basin and its flushing value as exists today.

MR. CAMMERER: COL SULTAN, have you any questions on that point?

COL. SULTAN: The Commissioners of course are interested very much in the traffic situation, and I am wondering what study was made of that situation and the magnitude of the traffic now using that bridge. Approximately

Faintly visible text at the bottom left corner reads "Cincinnati, Ohio".

• *Journal of Management Education* 31(10):1033-1044

Our Commission has as members Gen.

• that no other man could do

30,000 vehicles pass over that bridge a day, of which a good bit of it is truck traffic. We do not think that will be able to move freely in and out of the District with the street arrangement suggested in the design.

MR. POPE: The last authoritative study of that was made in 1928, and as an architect I did not feel competent to make any suggestions. The plan of 1928 I took as the basis of this entire layout. I believe I made some mistakes because I had the wrong information. Whatever happened, I felt the subject would have to be restudied, and that it was a study to be made by the Planning Commission.

COL. SULTAN: I am not familiar with the 1928 study, but in looking at this study, the traffic must come across the bridge and make a sharp angular curve to get up to the main connecting street, which is 14th Street, and you are impressed with the difficulty those 30,000 vehicles are going to have to get through.

MR. CAMMERER: The railroad was also a little bit off.

MR. POPE: I can see that now, but it was not done intentionally, I can assure you. It was because I had the wrong information. It is a subject that should come up for consideration by the Planning Commission. My function is an architect, and I was confining myself to the monument itself and the area around it, and then borrowing the other information from the Park and Planning Commission.

COL. SULTAN: The situation that existed in 1928 when that plan was made, is not the situation that exists there today. We have got to make a new estimate of the situation of what traffic will be in the future. 30,000 vehicles come over that bridge every day.

MR. CAMMERER: Both Commissions have architects and landscape architects. Can't we hear from them?

MR. DUBBARD: In your estimate, how much of the plan can be built with the \$3,000,000 authorized?

Received 10 June 2004; accepted 21 July 2004

MR. POPE: The monument itself, and you see a vertical wall running around it with steps between on the front elevation. The estimate covers 75 feet of piles supporting the monument, the monument itself and includes those walls. I tried to have it conform with that division that was made in the Lincoln Memorial and the base that it sits on.

MR. HUBBARD: Have you any estimate as to what the total cost would be to create a suitable setting for the building as proposed. The United States would be obligated to carry out the plan. You are in effect pledging the Government to do a job. What is the cost of that job going to be?

MR. POPE: The same procedure was adopted as for the Lincoln Memorial. How much the cost of the reflecting basin, the roads and planting, and the conditions to Constitution Avenue would be was determined. It was found the immediate necessity of the roads was in the neighborhood of \$225,000, that was for the roads needed to approach that monument and for the rest of the base. In addition to that, we took an area that was the area of the entire Basin, and I said that we were concerned with the area of that Basin because we were changing the contour. Therefore we should have an estimate of the cost of such changing of contours of the Basin. First the fill, plus the roads, the planting and trees, and after you take everything into consideration it comes to one million and a quarter in addition to the \$3,000,000. That one and a quarter million concerns the development of the land about the memorial which is not called for in the Act. The memorial makes a change in the landscape architecture in that neighborhood.

MR. SETTLE: Will you read the figures to be inserted in the record?

MR. POPE: The \$3,000,000 includes the upper terrace and the fill.

COL. HANNUM: What was the estimate for the foundations?

MR. POPE read from estimates he had prepared.

MR. HUBBARD: That covers the approval of the entire area involved?

[illegible]

• **Available from** all 100 member agencies

• on 11/11/11 11:11 AM 11/11/11 11:11 AM

2. **THESIS:** I have not yet written an essay on this topic.

© 2000 by the American Psychological Association, 0893-3200/00/\$12.00 DOI: 10.1037/0893-3200.14.1.101

—It is obligated to carry out the plan. You are in effect placing the

... the same question as to the Lincoln Memorial.

MR. POPE: That includes roads and planting. That includes everything \$4,805,000. There are four borings now and they show 78 feet.

SEN. KING: Is it solid rock?

MR. POPE: It is solid.

SEN. KING: Are we to have a memorial as outlined in the papers? Is that all agreed upon and we have nothing to say about it?

MR. CAMERER: The situation is this. This is a joint meeting with the Fine Arts Commission, and after securing this information, we are going into executive session. The Jefferson Memorial Commission was authorized by Congress to (read from bill).

SEN. KING: And they have selected this site and there is nothing we can do about it.

MR. RANDOLPH: The Memorial Commission was unanimous for this site.

MR. HUBBARD: And the \$3,000,000 after expended absolutely pledges the United States to supply more.

MR. CAMERER: No appropriation has yet been made for the memorial, but the Act authorizes an appropriation of \$3,000,000.

SEN. KING: Have we any voice in the matter? What have we got to do with it?

MR. CAMERER: The Fine Arts Commission and Planning Commission has been requested by that Commission to make such suggestions as it may find necessary to make. If this Commission finds they have any objections to the site, the Memorial Commission would take it into consideration. That Commission has gone on record in favor of this site, with the approval of the President. Have you any questions you would like to ask, SENATOR?

SEN. KING: I was rather shocked when I learned they had selected the Tidal Basin for the memorial.

14,000,000. There are two hundred and fifty thousand people in the city.

15,000,000. It is a solid.

16,000,000. We are to have a memorial in the city.

17,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

18,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

19,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

20,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

21,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

22,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

23,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

24,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

25,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

26,000,000. The memorial is a solid.

MR. CAMMERER: That has always been reserved by the plan of 1901 for an outstanding memorial.

SEN. KING: While I am not in favor of the expenditure of millions of dollars for a memorial to Jefferson, this might awaken the American people to the democracy which existed in Jefferson's time at a time when the trend seems to be to make this country an autocracy.

MR. RANDOLPH: The same problem presents itself as when the Lincoln Memorial was built, doesn't it?

MR. POPE: The same procedure is being adopted in this instance as for the Lincoln Memorial. There was a fixed sum for the memorial and an additional sum for the rest. It was all a developing proposition. The same thing is true in this instance. We have a figure of \$3,000,000 for the memorial, and we presented a \$3,000,000 estimate to the contractor and we presented it in good faith. In addition to that, there is another sum involved for the landscaping of the area surrounding the memorial. We have estimated one and a quarter million for the fill, roads, etc. Half a million would give us access to the memorial.

COL. SULTAN: I would be interested in knowing the engineering estimate of the cost of the causeways. Is there anything in the way of piles under those roads leading to the memorial? What is the method of supporting them?

MR. POPE: I think a suitable foundation for a road has been considered and the price given takes into consideration that factor.

MR. NICHOLS: You say you have the same amount of water as now. The new shape of the Tidal Basin is different. Are you sure it will have the proper clearance?

MR. POPE: This matter has been presented to the War Department and it was said that the new form would give 70 percent * * * of the present area and function satisfactorily as far as clearance of that channel is concerned. We

the committee: They had always been working on the basis of 1941 for the
representative committee.

Q. Now, with regard to the question of the
deliberations, would it be correct to say that the
the committee was divided in deliberations at a time when the
the committee was divided in deliberations at a time when the
the committee was divided in deliberations at a time when the

A. Yes, that is correct. The committee was divided in
deliberations at a time when the committee was divided in
deliberations at a time when the committee was divided in

Q. Now, the procedure is being adopted in this instance as for
the committee. There was a fixed sum for the memorial and an additional
sum for the work. It was all a developing proposition. The same thing is done
in this instance. We have a figure of \$2,000,000 for the memorial, and we

have a figure of \$2,000,000 for the memorial, and we
have a figure of \$2,000,000 for the memorial, and we
have a figure of \$2,000,000 for the memorial, and we
have a figure of \$2,000,000 for the memorial, and we
have a figure of \$2,000,000 for the memorial, and we

Q. Now, I would be interested in knowing the estimate
of the cost of the causeways. Is there anything in the way of miles under

A. Yes, I think a suitable foundation for a road has been considered
and the cost of the causeways is being estimated. I think a suitable
foundation for a road has been considered and the cost of the causeways
is being estimated. I think a suitable foundation for a road has been
considered and the cost of the causeways is being estimated.

Q. Now, you say you have the same amount of water as now. The new
scheme is different. Are you sure it will have the same

A. This matter has been presented to the Government and it
is being considered. I think a suitable foundation for a road has been
considered and the cost of the causeways is being estimated.

Q. Now, you would give 70 percent of the present area and
the Government is satisfied as far as clearance of that channel is concerned.

tried to make it 100 percent. There is another element that enters in here. The cherry trees will have to be replanted. They are too close together.

SEN. KING: It seems to me that we ought to know what the ultimate cost is going to be, and it seems to me you and your associates could pretty well envision what is necessary to be done to complete the project. It seems to me that unless we know what those factors are, we would not be justified in going forward. It seems to me that in the development of this grandiose scheme which you are proposing, you are going to entail an expense of eight or nine million dollars.

MR. POPE: Our estimate given for the memorial plus the improvements that I assume you refer to is \$4,800,000. One of the difficulties if we assume that the present bridges and roads are not adequate is the traffic problem. There will be a situation there that will have to be corrected. If we carry out the scheme as proposed, it appears to involve \$4,800,000, \$3,000,000 for the memorial and the rest for the Park and Planning Commission's improvement of the land surrounding the memorial.

MR. CAMMERER: Any other questions?

MR. W. A. DELANO: Are you going on the assumption that the Monument Grounds are not going to be completed as shown. If that is not to be done, would you want as a formal a treatment for the basin as is shown there?

MR. POPE: I do not feel responsible for the Monument gardens, but I am assuming that the plan of 1901 is a vital plan and will be carried out some day. I simply started on the assumption that the north axis of the White House has been conceded to be since 1901 as the site for a major monument, and I was requested to make a drawing for that site.

MR. W. A. DELANO: It does depend a good deal on whether the Monument Grounds were developed as arranged there.

MR. POPE: I am trying to design a memorial and am leaving the other features to the Planning Commission.

tried to make it 100 percent. There is nothing wrong with it but
The heavy work will have to be repeated. They are too close together.

MR. LEE: It seems to me that we ought to know what the ultimate
cost is going to be, and it seems to me you and your associates could pretty
well indicate what is necessary to do that. It seems to me that
if we know what those factors are, we would not be justified in
going forward. It seems to me that in our development it is
absolutely certain you are proposing, you are going to entail an expense of eight
or nine million dollars.

MR. LEE: I assume you refer to is \$4,800,000. One of the difficulties is we assume
that the present bridges and roads are not adequate in the traffic problem.
There will be a question about that will have to be decided. It is hard
out the scheme as proposed, it appears to involve \$4,800,000, \$3,000,000 for
the memorial and the rest for the Park and Planning Commission's improvement
of the park surrounding the memorial.

MR. CALLER: Any other questions?

MR. W. A. DELANEY: Are you going on the assumption that the Monument
Grounds are not going to be completed as shown. If that is not to be done,
would you want to have a small monument in the park as is shown there?

MR. LEE: I do not feel responsible for the Monument grounds, but I am
convinced that the plan is a vital plan and will be carried out.
I think it is very important to have a monument in the park and
it has been decided to do this and the site has been chosen.
We requested to make a drawing for that site.

MR. W. A. DELANEY: It does depend a good deal on whether the Monument

is to be designed to design a memorial and am leaving the other

Mr. POPE here submitted the following detailed estimates of cost of the Memorial proper and treatment of the grounds, Tidal Basin, etc.

S T A T E M E N T N O. 1 0

Approximate Estimated Cost of Erection and Completion of
Proposed Thomas Jefferson Memorial On Tidal Basin Site,
Washington, D. C., Based On Circular Plan

ESTIMATE "A"

Building and Upper Terrace to bottom of wall; Building to be of Georgia Marble Exterior and Interior, Paving, Steps, etc., of Granite. Estimate is based on piles to rock 75'0" below mean low water line. Estimate includes allowances for Statue, Inscriptions, Pediment Sculpture, and Architect's Fees.	\$2,995,000.
--	--------------

ESTIMATE "B"

Terraces, Steps, Approaches, from Bottom of Upper Terrace Wall down to Roadway at Grade. Original short piles for foundation.	\$ 252,000.
Additional for long piles	150,000.
Total	<u>\$ 402,000.</u>

ESTIMATE "C"

Tidal Basin Development, cut and Fill, Roads, Granite work at Water's Edge, Trees, Etc.	\$1,358,000
Addition for extra conduits requested by National Park Service	<u>50,000</u>
Total	\$1,408,000.
Grand Total	\$4,805,000.

1. This estimate and following detailed estimates of cost

for the proposed work and treatment of the grounds, Tidal Basin, etc.

STATEMENT NO. 10

Approximate Estimated Cost of Erection and Completion of
Tidal Basin Development, and the
Washington, D. C., Based On Circular Plan

ESTIMATE "A"

Building and Upper Terrace to bottom of
wall; Building to be of Georgia Marble
Interior and exterior, Paving, Steps,
of Granite. Estimate is based on piles
to rock 75' below mean low water line.
Estimate includes allowances for Statues,
Inscriptions, Pediment
and other work.

\$2,385,000.

Interior, Steps, Paving, and other work
of Upper Terrace Wall down to Roadway
at Grade. Original short piles for
foundation.

\$ 252,000.

Additional for long piles

\$ 402,000.

Total

ESTIMATE "C"

Tidal Basin Development, and the
Washington, D. C., Based On Circular Plan.
Trees, Etc.
Additional for extra work
required at the Tidal Basin

\$1,352,000

\$1,402,000.

Grand Total

STATEMENT NO 10A

BREAKDOWN OF ESTIMATES BASED ON CIRCULAR PLAN
OF STATEMENTS # 8B AND C

	<u>Fuller Co. Wash.</u>	<u>Turner Const. Company</u>	<u>Architect's Estimate</u>
<u>ESTIMATE "A"</u>			
Excavation & Fill (Piles -75' 0" below mean low water)	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	(Seelye \$390,000. (Monks \$400,000.
Foundations	274,500	255,000	
	213,000	73,200	
Reinforced Concrete) Brick Tile, etc.)	344,000	359,300	
Structural Steel	42,000	40,000	
Granite, Marble, and Cast Stone Ceiling)	1,949,000	1,869,300	
All Other Trades	53,500	50,000	
Bond	43,100	39,600	
Commission	285,000	270,000	
Total	\$3,229,100	\$2,981,400	\$2,748,000
Allowances (See Statement 8B)	77,000	77,000	77,000
	\$3,306,100	\$3,058,400	\$2,825,000
Architect's Commission	198,300	183,500	170,000
Total	\$3,504,400	\$3,241,900	\$2,995,000

JOHN RUSSELL POPE, ARCHITECT
542 Fifth Avenue, New York.

March 19, 1937

Statement of Assets and Liabilities

as of March 15, 1937

Assets		Liabilities	
Cash	100,000	Accounts Payable	50,000
Accounts Receivable	200,000	Notes Payable	100,000
Inventory	150,000	Long-Term Debt	250,000
Fixed Assets	500,000	Other Liabilities	50,000
		Total Liabilities	450,000
Total Assets	950,000		
		Equity	500,000
		Capital Stock	250,000
		Reserves	250,000
		Total Equity	500,000
		Total Liabilities and Equity	950,000

March 15, 1937

J. Edgar Hoover
Director

OFFICE OF JOHN RUSSELL POPE, ARCHITECT
New York City
Office Instructions and Report

BUILDING - THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL March 19, 1937.

Dict. by D. P. Higgins

The original Estimate "A" for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial was secured in October 1936 from several well-known builders who have had experience in Washington; namely, The George A. Fuller Company, Turner Construction Company, and North-Eastern Construction Company.

While it is true their estimates were based on small scale sketch drawings and incomplete information as to site and foundations conditions, we feel that the experience of the builders enabled them to make due allowances for the lack of detailed data which would be shown on a complete set of working drawings.

However, these estimates were not made by short cut methods, such as the cubic foot cost method, but actual quantities were taken off, and the whole problem was very carefully considered, and based on actual quantities and prices. The closeness of the estimates bears out the thoroughness with which they were made.

In the original estimates the site conditions were, of course, unknown, but from data obtained from points nearby where construction work had been carried out, we made an approximation that rock would be encountered 75' - 0" below low water. It is interesting to note that three borings that had been completed under the building itself show rock at 78' - 0" below low water. This would not make any substantial change in the estimates.

We have referred the question back to the builders for a check, and they see no reason to believe there has been any change in the cost of the work with the exception of the general rise in building costs since October 1936 to date, which amounts to between five and ten per cent.

As to Estimate "B" for the terraces and approaches, we were again handicapped by a lack of data concerning the site and foundation conditions. We originally assumed that as the weight of these terraces and approaches would be so much less than for the building, short friction piles could be used for these foundations, and our estimates were based upon that assumption.

The National Parks Service has since stated that in their judgment the foundations for the terraces should also be carried down to rock. Now that borings are being made, the results of the ones completed to date indicate that we will have to use long piles instead of the short piles originally estimated. The exact determination of this will, of

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Office Memorandum and Report

March 12, 1937.

TO: CHIEF, BUREAU OF RECONSTRUCTION

FROM: D. D. Higgins

The original estimate of the cost of the proposed work was prepared in October 1936 from several well-known sources and was approved by the Board of Engineers, the General A. B. Baker Company, and the National Park Service, and the National Park Service.

It is to be noted that the original estimate was based on the assumption that the work would be completed by the end of 1937, and that the cost of the work would be \$1,000,000. It is to be noted that the original estimate was based on the assumption that the work would be completed by the end of 1937, and that the cost of the work would be \$1,000,000.

However, these estimates were not made by the National Park Service, but by the Board of Engineers, the General A. B. Baker Company, and the National Park Service, and the National Park Service. It is to be noted that the original estimate was based on the assumption that the work would be completed by the end of 1937, and that the cost of the work would be \$1,000,000.

In the original estimate the site conditions were, of course, assumed to be the same as they were in 1936. It is to be noted that the original estimate was based on the assumption that the work would be completed by the end of 1937, and that the cost of the work would be \$1,000,000. It is to be noted that the original estimate was based on the assumption that the work would be completed by the end of 1937, and that the cost of the work would be \$1,000,000.

We have referred the question back to the builders for a final estimate, and they see no reason to believe there has been any change in the cost of the work with the exception of the general rise in building costs since October 1936 to date, which amounts to between 10% and 15%.

As to Estimate "B" for the terraces and approaches, we were again handicapped by a lack of data concerning the site and foundation conditions. We originally assumed that the cost of these terraces and approaches would be \$1,000,000, but we have now revised this estimate to \$1,500,000.

The National Park Service has since stated that in their judgment the foundation for the proposed work is of sufficient size to support the work. That borings are being made, the results of the ones completed to date indicate that the foundation is of sufficient size to support the work. The exact determination of this will, of course, be made by the National Park Service.

course, depend upon the results of all test borings now being made. At present four borings have been made on the site on the present land, and nine are yet to be made. No borings have been made under the present water to date.

With the change from short piles to long piles for the terraces, we find that this might add approximately \$150,000. to our original Estimate "B".

Our original Estimate "C" has not been changed, as there has been no physical change and no reason to anticipate any change in cost except for the general cost increase referred to above. Estimate "C" was secured from John Monks & Sons, who have had extensive and comprehensive experience in this particular type of work.

SEN. KING: Is that \$4,800,000 broken down so we may estimate how much each individual project will cost?

Mr. POPE: Yes. I will give you a copy of it if you wish.

MR. CAMMERER: If there are no other questions on the part of the two Commissioners, we will go into executive session now.

MR. HUBBARD: One question I have in mind. We are told that the estimate of \$3,000,000 is a contract estimate which is supposed to be sound; that it includes only the building and the foundation down to bed rock. Even at that figure it seems to have been brought out before us that that was on the basis of 75 feet, whereas it is liable to be 80 or 85 feet. I am wondering how accurate that estimate is. Plainly if we spend the \$3,000,000, we are committing the Government to do certain things, where it will be necessary to make a good job, and we are told that something under \$2,000,000 will do everything. We are not told how accurate our full estimate is. I do not believe that the rest can be done with \$2,000,000. We get the Government embarked on a very uncertain thing, including traffic and handling of water. We ought to appreciate that what the Act says which authorized this procedure was that a site should be chosen and a monument created at a

... toward the ... of all ...
... have been made to ...
... and ... to be ...
... the ...

With the change from ...
... this ...
... "

... estimate "C" has not been changed, as there has been
... and no reason to anticipate any change in cost
...
...
... in this particular type of work.

... : ...

... will ...

... : ...

... : If there are no other questions on the part of the ...

... we will ...

... : One question I have in mind. We are told that the

estimate of \$2,000,000 is a contract estimate which is supposed to be sound;

... the ...

Even at that figure it seems to have been brought out before us that that was

on the basis of 75 feet, whereas it is liable to be 80 or 85 feet. I am

wondering how accurate that estimate is. Plainly if we spend the \$2,000,000,

we are committing the Government to do certain things, where it will be

necessary to make a good job, and we are told that something under \$2,000,000

will do everything. We are not told how accurate our full estimate is. I

do not believe that the rest can be done with \$2,000,000. We get the

Government embarked on a very uncertain thing, including traffic engineering

of water. We ought to appreciate that what the Act says which authorized

... was that a site should be chosen and a monument erected at a

cost not exceeding \$3,000,000. It was to be a \$3,000,000 job, not a \$5,000,000 job or a \$10,000,000 job. I am not sure of my memory, but I think the total cost of the Lincoln Memorial was something like \$4,000,000. I wonder whether from the point of view of reasonable expenditure of millions of dollars * * * To my mind there is a very important question of design there. The big design is with the monument in the middle. I should suppose that the Capitol and the Washington Monument would be more important than this building. It seems to me that this building is more important than the Lincoln Memorial. You have two elevations before you and actually what you see is the elevation of this building with its steps above the general base level. This is your plane of reference and comparing those two, this new building is not less important than the Lincoln Memorial. Moreover the Lincoln Memorial is further away and this building is again out of scale aesthetically as well as financially. That is a perfectly reasonable site for a building, but when that Act was passed, it was a very just decision that it was something like a \$3,000,000 job. To get public money committed to that which may run to \$10,000,000 is certainly doubtful procedure.

MR. CAMMERER: My engineers have checked very carefully. We have had some test borings made without which we could not talk intelligently. My engineers say that instead of a figure of nearly \$5,000,000 it will run to \$10,000,000 or more.

MR. NICHOLS: Has there been any breakdown on what MR. POPE estimates it will cost? Do we know whether that does cover all the street changes that may be necessary?

MR. NAGLE: We have not been furnished with a copy.

MR. CAMMERER: About all you have got to go on is the estimate by MR. POPE.

MR. WAGLE: And based on our previous experience with these jobs.

Frank discussion now.

MR. NICHOLS: Where is the outlet and the flood gates? Do we know how they are going to discharge the water? It seems to me there is going to be a cause-way coming down here. Do we know what the outlet of this water is. It seems to me there might be a great difference in those figures when you get that information.

COL. SULTAN: That is going to have to be studied very carefully.

COL. HANNU: The War Department has not committed themselves as to the effect of the plan on the discharge of the water through Washington Channel. Even though they maintain 100 percent water surface, there is going to be less discharge.

MR. HANSHIE: I regret that the whole problem has been approached as an architectural one and has not been approached as a practical one. It has not been a study of collaboration of the arts. It is not only an architectural monument. Proper expression of the qualities to be brought out in the making of this monument to the man have not been considered. My feeling would be that this is a cold, soulless and too formal a representation as an expression of a memorial to so great a man who had such a warm nature. It is easy to criticise the whole thing from an architectural point of view, as well as the other arts, which should have just as an important a part in the making of a memorial to a great man.

SEN. KING: You think it lacks soul?

MR. WASSIP: Yes, it is just architectural.

MR. CAMMERER: I think the Memorial Commission are expecting from us some definite letters on this. You have heard a great many criticisms about the use of the water to the northwest of the memorial, the tremendous effect on the streets around the memorial, etc. All of those things I

MR. WATKINS: And based on our previous experience with these jobs.

MR. NICHOLS: Where is the outlet and the flood gates? Do we know how they are going to discharge the water? It seems to me there is going to be a cause-way coming down here. Do we know what the outlet of this water is. It seems to me there might be a great difference in those figures when you get that information.

COL. SUTHER: That is going to have to be studied very carefully.

COL. HANCOCK: The War Department has not committed themselves as to the effect of the plan on the discharge of the water through Washington Channel.

MR. WATKINS: I regret that the whole problem has been approached as an architectural one and has not been approached as a practical one. It has not been a study of collaboration of the arts. It is not only an architectural monument. Proper expression of the qualities to be brought out in the making of this monument to the man have not been considered. It is feeling would be that this is a cold, soulless and too formal a representation as an expression of a memorial to a great man who had a very human nature. It is easy to criticize the whole thing from an architectural point of view, as well as the other arts, which should have just as an important a part in the making of a memorial to a great man.

MR. WATKINS: Yes, it is just architectural.

MR. WATKINS: I think the Memorial Commission are expecting from us some definite letters on this. You have heard a great many criticisms about the use of the water to the northwest of the memorial, the tremendous effect on the streets around the memorial, etc. All of these things I

would like to have taken up here. I think we ought to have a very frank discussion now.

SEN. KING: It seems to me too much of the mausoleum type. It doesn't represent his views with respect to liberty, particularly in his educational concepts, public schools, universities, etc. This is just a thought expressed. It seems to me it is a mausoleum and not a monument.

MR. HUBBARD: I suppose I am saying the same thing. The other points in this development, in each case the monument is interlocked into its surroundings. It is a part of a larger thing. A tremendous amount of careful work has gone to arrange the mall which should be a part of the whole area. It doesn't bear any particular relation to anything else.

MAJ. CLARKE: In connection with this matter I find it difficult to be temperate. I have been on the Fine Arts Commission for five years, but this is the first time in my memory that a most important project has been referred to the Commission after it has been completely "frozen" as far as the designers are concerned. I had always hoped and had been led to believe that the design for this memorial would be open to competition, because I feel that here is an opportunity for an architect, landscape architect, engineer and sculptor to work together to bring about something that would not only be practical but would include all the qualities mentioned in connection with Jefferson. Apparently that did not seem to be feasible to the Memorial Commission. At the last meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts I still thought there would be a competition to find a group of designers who would get into the spirit of the venture so as to build into it some of the great character of Jefferson. There would have been a stimulating value to all the professions interested; it would have been of nation-wide interest; it would have brought

would like to have taken up here. I think we ought to have a very

frank discussion now.

SEN. HING: It seems to me too much of a humanitarian type. It

doesn't represent his views with respect to liberty, particularly in his

educational concepts, public schools, universities, etc. This is just

a thought expressed. It seems to me it is a humanitarian and not a monument.

MR. HUBBARD: I suppose I am saying the same thing. The other points

in this development, in each case the monument is interlocked into the

surroundings. It is a part of a larger thing. A tremendous amount of

careful work has gone to arrange the wall which should be a part of the

whole area. It doesn't bear any particular relation to anything else.

MR. CLARK: In connection with this matter I find it difficult to

be compared. I have been on the Fine Arts Commission for five years,

and this is the first time in my memory that a most important project

has been referred to the Commission after it has been completely "ironed"

as far as the designers are concerned. I had always hoped and had been

led to believe that the design for this memorial would be open to some

petition, because I feel that there is an opportunity for an architect,

landscape architect, engineer and sculptor to work together to bring

about something that would not only be practical but would include all

the qualities mentioned in connection with Jefferson. Apparently that

did not seem to be feasible to the Memorial Commission. At the last

meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts I still thought there would be a

competition to find a group of designers who would get into the spirit of

the venture so as to build into it some of the great character of Jefferson.

There would have been a stimulating value to all the professions inter-

ested; it would have been of nation-wide interest; it would have brought

out some of the new arts rather than transporting an ancient *partée* from Rome to this site in the form of the Pantheon. It is true that McKim and the Commission of 1901 visualized this as a *partée* for a building on this site. However,^{it} doesn't seem reasonable that that Commission gave the kind of thought to this particular phase of the central composition of Washington that they would have had they had more time. Since 1901 we have advanced a long way and the different professions have grown closer together than ever before. I think we are not as far advanced in this type of design (referring to Mr. Pope's drawings) as the arts have advanced since 1901, and so I feel that this solution of Mr. Pope's is extremely unfortunate * * * I feel it is useless for me at this time to discuss the area about the basin from the point of view of traffic. That problem must be carefully considered. It is obvious that the scheme submitted neglects the importance of traffic as a factor in the problem.

out some of the new side rather than strengthening an ancient party from Rome to this side in the town of the President. It is true that McKim and the Commission of 1901 visualized this as a party for a building on this side. However, ^{it} doesn't seem reasonable that that Commission gave the kind of thought to this particular phase of the central competition at Washington that they would have had had more time. Since 1901 we have advanced a long way and the different professions have grown closer together than ever before. I think we are not as far advanced in this type of design (referring to Mr. Pope's drawings) as the area have advanced since 1901, and so I feel that this solution of Mr. Pope's is extremely unfortunate. - I feel it is useless for me at this time to discuss the area about the basin from the point of view of traffic. That problem must be carefully considered. It is obvious that the scheme submitted neglects the importance of traffic as a factor in the problem.

Saturday, March 20, 1937.
12:00 Noon. H. Lintner.

Maj. Clarke: * * * A glance at the lagoon clearly indicates a lack of any study of the character or the shape of the water areas; it is purely academic in character. I for one would never give my stamp of approval to any portion of this design. I still hope that something fresh, something more indicative of Jefferson's character, might be designed for the cross axis.

Mr. Cammerer: Isn't it true, Maj. Clarke, that for the Lincoln Memorial they made a selection from several sites?

Maj. Clarke: Yes.

Mr. Cammerer: Although they did have Pope make alternative schemes for the present site, in Arlington and at the Soldiers' Home Grounds, I believe.

Mr. Moore: Just as alternative schemes have been presented here for the various sites in town.

Mr. Cammerer: By Mr. Pope, yes--but they were not in the nature of a competition.

Mr. Moore: No.

Mr. Nichols: I have always given a lot of consideration to the completion of that kite-shaped arrangement. Speaking purely as a layman, I can't get out of my mind that it is entirely out of scale with the rest of the composition. The area inside of the lower masonry wall (and I believe the eye will get that) you have eight times the masonry in that wall as you have inside the Lincoln Memorial. We have about 50 per cent more steps which will certainly give it a very relatively over-predominating appearance. Then you have some 25 to 30 per cent additional height above the level of the street. I can't get it out of my mind that the street level will give you the relationship of the two as you drive from one to the other, and I do not believe Mr. Hubbard stressed enough that

Wednesday, March 20, 1935.
12:00 noon. P. M. 1:00 pm.

Mr. Nichols: I have always given a lot of consideration to the completion

of my mind that it is entirely out of scale with the rest of the composition.

The area inside of the lower masonry wall (and I believe the eye will get away)

you have right there the masonry in fact well as you have inside the Lincoln

Memorial. It has about 25 per cent more space which will certainly give it a

very relatively over-proportioned appearance. Then you have seen 25 per

cent additional height above the level of the street. I can't get it out of my

mind that it is entirely out of scale with the rest of the composition.

Mr. Nichols: I have always given a lot of consideration to the completion

of my mind that it is entirely out of scale with the rest of the composition.

The area inside of the lower masonry wall (and I believe the eye will get away)

you have right there the masonry in fact well as you have inside the Lincoln

Memorial. It has about 25 per cent more space which will certainly give it a

very relatively over-proportioned appearance. Then you have seen 25 per

cent additional height above the level of the street. I can't get it out of my

mind that it is entirely out of scale with the rest of the composition.

The area inside of the lower masonry wall (and I believe the eye will get away)

you have right there the masonry in fact well as you have inside the Lincoln

Memorial. It has about 25 per cent more space which will certainly give it a

very relatively over-proportioned appearance. Then you have seen 25 per

cent additional height above the level of the street. I can't get it out of my

mind that it is entirely out of scale with the rest of the composition.

The area inside of the lower masonry wall (and I believe the eye will get away)

you have right there the masonry in fact well as you have inside the Lincoln

Memorial. It has about 25 per cent more space which will certainly give it a

very relatively over-proportioned appearance. Then you have seen 25 per

you can see both at the same time and that the Lincoln Memorial is twice as far away. With this eight times larger in the masonry enclosed area, with 50 per cent greater height of steps and structure itself, and only two-thirds the distance, it seems to me this would look twice as large. Then, I do not believe we have begun to consider how to handle the traffic. That is one of the great roads of the nation coming in there. I do not know what the increase will be, but it is a matter that must be given very serious consideration. Then, my own feeling is that the Tidal Basin area to the north of the proposed memorial is very unsatisfactory. I do not know what it is.

Maj. Clarke: It is square.

Mr. Nichols: Well, there is something wrong.

Maj. Clarke: In foreshortening it would appear to be square in the one direction in which it should appear a long rectangle.

Mr. Nichols: Before we determine any treatment of the Tidal Basin it seems to me we must insure the flushing of the Washington Channel. We must have some very careful studies of the impediment. Also this treatment proposed--from a study of the ground--will take out a lot of trees. I think we should give some recommendation on that. Whether any of the growth of old elm trees can be retained. But as to the study of traffic, from the engineering standpoint, we should not go into this hastily because it is fundamental to the plan. And then, I am trying to stay away from the amenities of it because most of you are more competent than I to judge that. But from the city planning standpoint, this is certainly out of relation to the other things, Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial and White House.

Sen. King: May I ask one question for information? I see that on the drawing back of the building there are other buildings. What are they? Are they a part of the scheme included in the cost, or just filling a gap?

you can see both at the same time and that the Lincoln Memorial is twice as far away. With this eight times larger in the memory and twice as far away, it seems to me this would look twice as large. Then, I do not believe we have begun to consider how to handle the traffic. That is one of the great roads of the nation coming in there. I do not know what the increase will be, but it is a matter that must be given very serious consideration. Then, of course, feeling is that the tidal basin area to the north of the proposed memorial is very unsatisfactory. I do not know what it is.

Mr. Nichols: It is square.

Mr. Nichols: Well, there is something wrong.

Mr. Nichols: In recommending it would appear that square is the one

direction in which it should appear a long rectangle.

Mr. Nichols: Before we determine any treatment of the tidal basin it

seems to me we must insure the clearing of the Washington Channel. We must have some very careful studies of the impediment. Also this treatment proposed from a study of the ground--will take out a lot of trees. I think we should give some consideration on that. Whether any of the growth of old trees can be retained. But as to the study of traffic, from the engineering standpoint, we should not go into this hastily because it is fundamental to the plan. And then, I am trying to stay away from the question of it because most of you are more competent than I to judge that. But from the city planning standpoint, this is certainly out of relation to the other things, Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial and White House.

Sen. King: May I ask one question for information? I see that on the

living back of the building there are other buildings. What are they? Are

they a part of the scheme included in the cost, or just filling a gap?

Maj. Clarke: It is entourage.

Mr. Hubbard: On the drawing - but not in the estimates.

Sen. King: Are they essential to the carrying out of the scheme?

Mr. Cammerer: They are just put in as possible treatment.

Mr. Moore: They are subject to Congress.

Sen. King: They are not necessary in order to balance the scheme as presented by Pope and the Commission?

Mr. Moore: No.

Mr. Cammerer: He did not include those in his estimate.

Sen. King: As we are issuing billions of dollars we might do a lot more. I have the information I want.

Mr. Lamb. My feelings about the memorial are very much in line with some of the remarks made by others. To me it is not an expression of the things that Jefferson stood for. Senator King expressed the hope that if this building were built, this memorial, it would represent a return to Jeffersonian simple democracy. I myself do not believe that the reproduction of Imperial Rome in the shape of the Pantheon would represent in the slightest degree that simplicity, honesty of character that I think he stood for. I think this is purely academic, without expression, and I say it very feelingly and very strongly. To me it does not represent a memorial to such a man as Jefferson.

Mr. Randolph: It was designed after a through study of Jefferson. He was very much an admirer of the Pantheon type of architecture. He adopted it at the University of Virginia, and in a number of letters endorsed that type of architecture.

Mr. Hubbard: I believe that the appearance of an architectural mass depends on its size. A design that might be entirely suitable for a family of four could not be merely inflated to suit a bigger family. I wonder if

Mr. Clarke: It is entourage.

Mr. [unclear]: On the dining - but not in the [unclear].

Mr. [unclear]: It is [unclear] to the [unclear] of the [unclear].

Mr. [unclear]: Why are [unclear] in [unclear] [unclear].

Mr. Moore: They are subject to Congress.

Mr. [unclear]: They are not necessary in order to [unclear] the [unclear] as

presented by [unclear] and the Commission?

Mr. Moore: No.

Mr. [unclear]: He did not include those in his estimate.

Mr. [unclear]: As we are [unclear] millions of dollars as [unclear] do a [unclear] more.

I have the information I want.

Mr. [unclear]: My feelings about the memorial are very much in line with

some of the remarks made by others. To me it is not an expression of the [unclear]

that Jefferson stood for. Something else expressed the hope that if this build-

ing were built, this memorial, it would represent a return to Jeffersonian

single democracy. I myself do not believe that the reproduction of Imperial

home in the shape of the Jefferson would represent in the slightest degree what

simplicity, honesty of character that I think he stood for. I think this is

purely academic, without expression, and I say it very feelingly and very

strongly. To me it does not represent a memorial to such a man as Jefferson.

Mr. Randolph: It was designed after a thorough study of Jefferson. He

was very much an admirer of the Pantheon type of architecture. He adopted it

at the University of Virginia, and in a number of letters endorsed that type

of architecture.

Mr. [unclear]: I believe that the appearance of an architectural [unclear]

depends on its [unclear]. A design [unclear] might be entirely suitable for a family

of four could not be [unclear] initiated to with a slight [unclear]. I wonder if

if we have considered the difference in size of this dome and that on the University of Virginia?

Mr. Wm. Delano: If Thomas Jefferson had had money enough he might have made that one bigger.

Mr. Hubbard: I try to judge what he liked by what he did.

Mr. Settle: May I say this. As a man who spent about 10 years looking at that dome on the University of Virginia, it is about one-third the diameter. Except there is an approach to it of longer steps that gives it a very much higher standing on the ground than the Pantheon which has only a few steps. I am talking about the rotunda at the University of Virginia.

Sen. King: I do not concede that the University of Virginia building should determine the character of building to be erected in memory of Jefferson.

Mr. Randolph. They were not. This is taken from his latest works.

Col. Hanum: Mr. Pope made some remark, I believe, about the opinion of the War Department on the effect of this structure in relation to its effect on the discharge in the Channel. I have here from the records a copy of a letter sent by the Acting Secretary of War Department October 7, 1936, which I will read if the Commission wishes. (Read the letter, which is attached following this page)

Sen. King: Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to go. I just want to make this observation. I hope no definite conclusion will be expressed by these Commissions today. If it is determined, I want to be registered voting No. I think more study should be made of the ultimate cost. I am sure it will cost at least \$8,000,000, and I do not want to be a party to a vote for such a project. I do not want to be a party to a mausoleum.

If we have considered the difference in size of the house and that on the

University of Virginia.

Mr. DeLoach: If Thomas Jefferson had had money money he might have

made that one bigger.

Mr. Hubbard: I try to judge what he liked or what he did.

Mr. DeLoach: Now I say that, as a man who spent much of his money

at that time on the University of Virginia, it is about one-third the distance.

Except there is an approach to it of longer scope that gives it a very much

higher standing on the ground than the Jefferson which has only a few steps.

I am talking about the grounds at the University of Virginia.

Sen. King: I do not concede that the University of Virginia building

should determine the character of building to be erected in memory of Jefferson.

Mr. Randolph: They were not. This is taken from his latest writing.

Col. Hansen: Mr. Pope made some remarks, I believe, about the opinion of

the War Department on the effect of this structure in relation to the effect

on the character in the Capitol. I have said from the records a copy of a

letter sent by the Acting Secretary of War, Department October 7, 1936, which I

will read if the Commission wishes. (Read the letter, which is attached follow-

ing this page)

Sen. King: Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to go. I have said to make

this observation. I hope no definite conclusion will be suggested by these

Commissioners today. It is determined, I want to be understood today.

I think more study should be made of the minute work. I am sure it will

cost at least \$5,000,000, and I do not want to be a party to a vote that such

a project. I do not want to be a party to a memorandum.

COPY

War Department
WashingtonIn reply refer to E.C.
6150 (Jefferson - Thomas) S.

October 7, 1936.

Honorable John J. Boylan, Chairman,
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My dear Mr. Boylan:

I refer to your letter of August 13, 1936, in which you advise that the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission is preparing designs for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial on the Tidal Basin Site in general conformity with the Washington Plan of 1901 and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission Plan of 1928-29 for the future treatments of this area. You inclose photostats of the proposed development and request to be advised if these plans are satisfactory, in order that you may proceed with a design for the Memorial that will meet the cooperation and approval of this Department.

The Tidal Basin or reservoir, part of which is proposed to be utilized as a site for the Memorial to Thomas Jefferson, was planned about 1880 by S. T. Abert and Major W. J. Twining, Corps of Engineers, for the purpose of flushing Washington Channel. This channel is two miles long with a dead end at the upstream extremity and furnishes access to the commercial and yachting water front of Washington, D.C. The flushing action is gained by filling the tidal basin at each flood tide through automatic inlet gates from the Potomac River and discharging on each ebb tide through automatic outlet gates at the head of the Washington Channel. This system has been in continuous operation since construction and is solely responsible for the existing clean and sanitary conditions in the Washington Channel. The River and Harbor project for Washington Harbor provides for maintenance and operation of the inlet and outlet gates of the Tidal Basin.

The two plans forwarded in your letter propose a change in shape and a reduction in size of the Tidal Basin from the present one hundred and eleven acre area to about fifty acres. The inlet bridge and gates would be retained, but the volume of flushing water would be reduced by about 55 per cent. It is doubtful if satisfactory sanitary conditions could be maintained in the Wash-

War Department

Washington

October 1, 1934

In reply refer to R.O.

also (Jefferson - Thomas) &

Honorable John J. Boylan, Chairman,
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My dear Mr. Boylan:

I refer to your letter of August 13, 1934, in which you advise that the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission is preparing studies for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial on the Tidal Basin site in general conformity with the Washington Plan of 1921 and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission Plan of 1933-34 for the future development of this area. You inclose photographs of proposed development and request to be advised if these plans are satisfactory, in order that you may proceed with a design for the Memorial that will meet the cooperation and approval of this Department.

The Tidal Basin or reservoir, part of which is proposed to be utilized as a site for the Memorial to Thomas Jefferson, was planned about 1880 by S. T. Abert and Major W. J. Twining, Corps of Engineers, for the purpose of flushing Washington Channel. This channel is two miles long with a dead end at the upstream extremity and furnishes access to the commercial and yachting water front of Washington, D.C. The flushing action is gained by filling the tidal basin at low tide and discharging on each ebb tide through automatic outlet gates at the head of the Washington Channel. This action has been in continuous operation since construction and is satisfactory for the existing clean and sanitary conditions in the Washington Channel. The River and Harbor project for Washington Harbor provides for maintenance and operation of the inlet and outlet gates of the Tidal Basin.

The two plans forwarded in your letter propose a change in shape and a reduction in size of the Tidal Basin from the present one hundred and eleven acre area to about fifty acres. The inlet bridge and gates would be retained, but the volume of flushing water would be reduced by about 25 per cent. It is doubtful if satisfactory sanitary conditions could be maintained in the Wash-

ington Channel with this reduced flow. Furthermore, the existing inlet would be near the middle of the modified Tidal Basin and because of the irregular shape of this basin it is considered extremely doubtful if the filling and emptying operations would provide sufficient circulation to prevent stagnant conditions in the northern and western parts of the new basin. It is quite probable that a new means of filling would be required at a point near its westerly end.

No flood protection levees are provided for the Tidal Basin area, the authorized project being located on the line of Independence Avenue. Any reclamation of this water area should be carried to a height of about 10 feet above mean low water which would require a total depth of fill in the Tidal Basin of about 19 feet. The general area of this basin is underlain with soft mud and adjacent reclaimed areas have settled for years with the subsistence still evident. In the construction of the present inlet and outlet gates for the Tidal Basin piling were driven to a penetration of 85 feet or more below mean low water without reaching solid bottom conditions. Foundation conditions are, therefore, extremely unfavorable.

The existing River and Harbor project provides for the expenditure of Federal funds for the maintenance and improvement of Washington Channel and since the proposed changes in the Tidal Basin will materially reduce its effectiveness in the flushing of this channel the Department is unwilling to concur in the proposed plan for the development of the Tidal Basin area.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) MALIN CRAIG,

Acting Secretary of War.

inlet channel with the reduced flow. Furthermore, the existing inlet would be near the middle of the Tidal Basin and because of the irregular shape of this basin it is considered extremely doubtful if the filling and emptying operations would provide sufficient circulation to prevent stagnant conditions in the northern and western parts of the new basin. It is quite probable that a new means of filling would be required at a point near its westerly end.

No flood protection levees are provided for the Tidal Basin area, the authorized project being located on the line of Independence Avenue. Any reclamation of this water area should be carried to a height of about 10 feet above mean low water which would require a total depth of fill in the Tidal Basin of about 15 feet. The general area of this basin is underlain with soft mud and adjacent reclaimed areas have settled for years with the subsidence still evident. In the construction of the present inlet and outlet gates for the Tidal Basin piling were driven to a penetration of 85 feet or more below mean low water without reaching solid bottom conditions. Foundation conditions are, therefore, extremely unfavorable.

The existing River and Harbor project provides for the expansion of Federal funds for the maintenance and improvement of Washington Channel and since the proposed changes in the Tidal Basin will materially reduce its effectiveness in the draining of this channel the Department is unwilling to commit in the proposed plan for the development of the Tidal Basin area.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) MALIN CRAIG,

Acting Secretary of War.

Mr. Cammerer: Does the Commission of Fine Arts still adhere to this site as a site of great importance, if properly designed and treated?

Mr. Moore: That is a matter we have not discussed. We have discussed the matters as presented from time to time, but we have been told that the Jefferson Memorial people had adopted that site as it was their province to do, and that that site fell in with the development that we had always hoped for - a proper development of that site at some time, whenever it would come - and we welcome this an opportunity to get a development of that site; and we expected that the next step would be the proper development of the Washington Monument gardens and the finishing of the plan of 1901.

Mr. Cammerer: In other words the plan of 1901, reserving that for a memorial of proper design and treatment, still stands?

Mr. Moore: Without making any commitment . . .

Mr. Cammerer: I mean a proper design - including the flushing of the Channel, etc? ~~needed out, still eliminate possibilities of a change in~~

Mr. Moore: All those things would have to be worked out but the importance of that site has always been considered and discussed from time to time, and when the question came up as to whether that was a proper site for the Theodore ^{Roosevelt} Memorial, the Commission did not believe that his place in the history of the U.S. had been sufficiently settled to warrant giving him that place. Now the question comes up on Jefferson and the general discussion has been that Jefferson was a very proper person to occupy that site. That is as far as we have gone. These things have been entirely informal. It has not been formally before the Commission at all.

Mr. Cammerer: The Plan of 1901 contemplated a monument to the makers of the Constitution. It has always held that the south axis would have to be treated.

Mr. Gammeter: Does the Commission of Fine Arts still stand in this

side as a site of great importance, if properly designed and treated?

Mr. Moore: That is a matter we have not discussed. We have discussed

the matter as presented from time to time, but we have never told the

Jefferson Memorial people that they had adopted that site as it was their province to

do, and that site fell in with the development that we had always

hoped for - a proper development of that site at some time, whenever it would

come - and we welcome this an opportunity to get a development of that site;

and we expected that the next step would be the proper development of the

Washington Monument grounds and the finishing of the plan of 1901.

Mr. Gammeter: In other words the plan of 1901, reserving that for a

memorial of proper design and treatment, still stands?

Mr. Moore: Without making any commitment . . .

Mr. Gammeter: I mean a proper design - including the finishing of the

Channel, etc?

Mr. Moore: All those things would have to be worked out but the im-

portance of that site has always been considered and discussed from

time to time, and when the question came up as to whether that was a proper

site for the Theodore Memorial, the Commission did not believe that site

in the history of the U.S. had been sufficiently settled to warrant giving

him that place. Now the question comes up on Jefferson and the

discussion has been that Jefferson was a very important person in our history

and that is as far as we have come. Those things have been discussed in-

formal. It has not been formally before the Commission at all.

Mr. Gammeter: The plan of 1901 contemplated a monument to the makers

of the Constitution. It has always held that the south axis would have to be

treated.

Mr. Moore: Decision as to whether it should be a monument to a group or to an individual was left, by the Commission of 1901, to the future - to Congress.

Mr. Cammerer: But the site itself has never been. . .

Mr. Moore: It has never been questioned by the Fine Arts Commission.

Mr. Cammerer: I wonder if I might, in fairness to Mr. Delano, again present his views. I will take the liberty, for the benefit of the Fine Arts Commission to read this letter. This is a letter Mr. Eliot wrote me after he had written Mr. Delano for his views. He wrote back to Mr. Eliot, who has sent this to me (Read again Mr. Eliot's letter)

I merely present that for the record that the Fine Arts Commission and Mr. Randolph may have Mr. Delano's personal views. I would like to have Mr. Finnan talk about the cherry trees and others that will be destroyed.

Mr. Finnan: With the existing plans and changes in grade involved, as Mr. Nichols pointed out, will eliminate practically all the cherry trees and between 70 and 80 of the big elms. The story was given to the papers that the cherry trees could be moved, but those trees are now mature and their roots are all interwoven. It would be impossible to move them. They are approximately 20 years old and their normal span of life is 30 years. I am not convinced and I am not willing to say that they will live only 30 years. They are receiving more attention than the ordinary tree. So it is possible they will live to 40 years - the hardy ones.

Col. Sultan: How about the elms - are they in bad shape?

Mr. Finnan: They are in especially fine shape. They are fine trees.

Col. Sultan: How many would be destroyed, any idea?

Mr. Finnan: We estimated only in percentage. Just as a rough guess, there will be something like over 100 trees involved.

Mr. Moore: Decision as to whether it should be a monument to a group

or to an individual was left, by the Commission of 1901, to the future -

to Congress.

Mr. Gannett: But the idea itself has never been...

Mr. Moore: It has never been questioned by the House Committee.

Mr. Gannett: I wonder if I might, in reference to Mr. Moore, again

present his views. I will take the liberty, for the benefit of the House

Commission to read this letter. This is a letter Mr. Moore wrote me after he

had visited Mr. Moore for his views. He wrote me to Mr. Moore, who has now

this to me (read again Mr. Moore's letter)

I recently presented him for the record that the House Committee and

Mr. Gannett may have Mr. Moore's personal views. I would like to have

Mr. Moore talk about the cherry trees and others that will be destroyed.

Mr. Gannett: With the existing plans and changes in grade involved, as

Mr. Moore pointed out, will eliminate practically all the cherry trees and

between 70 and 80 of the big elms. The story was given to the papers that

the cherry trees could be moved, but those trees are now mature and their

roots are all interwoven. It would be impossible to move them. They are

approximately 25 years old and their normal span of life is 50 years. I am

not surprised that I am not willing to say that they will live only 30 years.

They are receiving more attention than the ordinary trees. As it is possible

they will live to 40 years - the hardy ones.

Col. Sifton: How about the elms - are they in bad shape?

Mr. Gannett: They are in especially fine shape. They are fine trees.

Col. Sifton: How many would be destroyed, any idea?

Mr. Gannett: Estimated only in percentages. That is a rough guess.

there will be something like over 100 trees involved.

Mr. Cammerer: Now is that a fair question. Any memorial, proper memorial of proper design, would necessarily have some effect on the Tidal Basin and the trees.

Maj. Clarke: Absolutely. Some effect. But I do not believe that in this case the architect has shown any degree of competency for anything outside of the monument itself. I think the whole layout is academic. It shows no intelligent study of the art of layout ~~and~~ of the land. It shows no evidence of competence.

Mr. Cammerer: That is, the treatment around the memorial?

Mr. Moore: It seems to settle down to this - whether that site can be utilized under all the circumstances for the Jefferson Memorial.

Mr. Cammerer: Well, can it be utilized to the satisfaction of both Commissions by changes being made in the design, which involves . . .

Maj. Clarke: In that connection I want it known that as for myself I favor the site for a memorial to Thomas Jefferson. I was asked, together with Mr. Patridge, two years ago, to make a report on the various sites for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which I gladly did, and the report was accepted by the Planning Commission for what it was worth. That report recommended this site for the Jefferson Memorial. My own opinion is that it is a site, and that Mr. Jefferson should be memorialized in that location.

Mr. Cammerer: It is the way it is done that you don't like?

Maj. Clarke: Yes, the way it is done.

Mr. Wm. Delano: As an architect, I hate to say anything about another architect, but I do feel that the importance of the site, it being our duty to speak up - that it is altogether too pompous. I think it overshadows the Lincoln Memorial. I think the arrangement of the Tidal Basin in the

Mr. Gammeter: Now is that a fair question? Any memorial, proper memorial of proper design, would necessarily have some effect on the trees. Basin and the trees.

Mr. Clarke: Absolutely. Some effect. But I do not believe that in this case the effect has shown any degree of sufficiency for explaining out- side of the monument itself. I think the whole layout is fantastic. It shows no intelligent study of the art of layout and of the land. It shows no evidence of competence.

Mr. Gammeter: That is, the treatment around the memorial? Mr. Moore: It seems to settle down to this - whether that site can be utilized under all the circumstances for the Jefferson Memorial.

Mr. Gammeter: Well, you do not seem to be satisfied with the location of both Com- missioners of changes being made in the design, which involves . . .

Mr. Clarke: In that connection I want to know what you know about the layout the site for a memorial to Thomas Jefferson. I was asked, together with Mr. Tamm, two years ago, to make a report on the various sites for the

Thomas Jefferson Memorial to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which I finally did, and the report was accepted by the Planning Commission and that it was correct. That report recommended that the site for the Jefferson Memorial

my own opinion is that it is a site, and that Mr. Jefferson should be memorialized in that location.

Mr. Gammeter: It is the way it is done that you don't like?

Mr. Clarke: Yes, the way it is done.

Mr. Wm. Delano: As an architect, I hate to say anything about another architect, but I do feel that the importance of the site, its being out- to speak up - that it is altogether too pompous. I think it overshadows the Lincoln Memorial. I feel the atmosphere of the place is in the

relation to the Monument Grounds has not been considered sufficiently. But my thoughts are all summed up in that one word - pompous.

Mr. Moore: I presume the Jefferson Memorial Commission considered Jefferson's intense love of classical architecture and were led by that to the approval of something classical. Because I am quite sure that if he did not like a building he would have torn it down as he did the beginning of the Capitol in Richmond and start over again. So I should say that something along these lines would be in keeping with his whole thought and life.

Mr. Wm. Delano: I do too, but I do not think that size necessarily makes classical architecture.

Mr. Moore: No, in fact I called Mr. Pope's attention to it on the model this morning. Mr. Pope had a good many trees but did not put them in the picture because he wanted to present the building itself. But I would suppose that something quieter, more in keeping with Monticello and having somewhat the feeling that the White House has, which is a white spot among trees, now that is really what is wanted, as I take it. There was another design presented which was very much more like Monticello, and the President, after studying the designs for some time, decided on this one as between the two. But I feel that the model upstairs indicates it is altogether too important for what is going on around it. I believe that the theory of McKim that the Lincoln Memorial should always be seen through trees is what you should get here too. The feeling of intimacy should govern there. So far as size is concerned, (I am sorry Mr. Pope is gone) is most important. And this is an open colonnade, not a closed building at all. The area, the size of the interior, is much smaller than the area of the Lincoln Memorial and the only question is that it is so far away from the Lincoln Memorial, that, really,

relation to the Monument Grounds has not been considered satisfactorily, and

my thoughts are all summed up in that one word - response.

Mr. Moore: I presume the Jefferson Memorial Commission considered

Jefferson's intense love of classical architecture and was led by that

to the approval of something classical. Because I am quite sure that if

he did not like a building he would have torn it down rather than let the architect

of the Capitol in Richmond and stand over again. So I would say that some-

thing along those lines would be in keeping with his whole thought and life.

Mr. Mr. Belmont: I do too, but I do not think that time necessarily

would classical architecture.

Mr. Moore: No, in fact I called Mr. Fogg's attention to it on the hotel

this morning. Mr. Fogg had a good many things out there but then in the

picture gallery he wanted to present the existing picture, and I would suppose

that existing picture, more in keeping with classical and having somewhat

the feeling that the White House has, which is a white stone house.

Now that is really what is wanted, as I said it. There was no other design

presented which was very much more like the White House, and the President, after

studying the design for some time, decided on this one as being the best.

But I feel that the model architect's building is in a different way important

for what is going on around it. I believe that the theory of McKim that

the classical building should always be seen through trees is what you should

not have lost. The feeling of intimacy which Jefferson had with his side

is preserved, (I am sorry Mr. Fogg is gone) is most important. And this is

an open relationship, not a closed relation as all. The tree, the stone of the

building, is much smaller than the stone of the Lincoln Memorial and the only

building in fact is as far away from the Lincoln Memorial, really,

with the trees in between, ~~that~~ does not count. The relative importance as between the White House and the Jefferson Memorial, I think, is a very legitimate question.

Mr. Nichols: Have you seen that comparative study.

Mr. Lamb: These studies, I can point out, are taken from the Washington Monument gardens looking down each axis. When you consider the view from across the river where you get the narrow end of the Lincoln Memorial, it would be very much smaller than the circular form of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial.

Mr. Cammerer: I am acting chairman only of this Commission and if you have any questions you want to bring out I hope you will take the Chair.

Mr. Moore:

Mr. Moore: I would like to hear more from Mr. Wm. Delano and Mr. Hubbard.

Mr. Delano. I am all for the site.

Mr. Lamb: I don't know of anyone else in this country who could fill that place. The three men were so closely associated that it seems to me perfectly fitting and proper that a Jefferson Memorial of some sort should take the last remaining place in that form.

Mr. Moore: Should it be based on precedence?

Mr. Lamb: I would like to go deeper: That it should be based on Jefferson's character; what he did for the country; what he represented. Whether it is classical or gothic does not interest me, if you can get the fundamental character of the man in architecture - it is not so easy but it can be done, - in classical, and I think it should be done in classical. It is Washington - it is the National Capital. There is a precedent for that form of architecture but I do not think it has to be done in the dry, pedantic, stilted, academic type.

legitimate question. As between the Misses Jones and the telephone company, I think, is a very

Mr. Nichols: Have you seen that comparative study.

подробнее см. приложение 1, таблица 1, колонка 1, строка 1.

have any questions you want to bring out I hope you will take the Chair.

Model TM

Mr. Moore: I would like to hear more from Mr. Mrs. Delano and Mr. Hubbard.

Mr. DeLano, I am all for the side.

Mr. Lamb: I don't know of anyone else in this country who could fill

Mr. Moore: Should it be based on precedents?

Mr. Lamb: I would like to go deeper: That it should be based on

Mr. Borie: I want to reinforce that statement. It is too much architecture. I deplore that much architecture. We all feel that way, that too much of a good thing is bad. Mr. Manship's remark was to the effect that there were other forms of memorial that were not of the mausoleum type, but open to the sky and sunlight - something that has more sculpture than architecture, primarily. It could be more of a sculptural concept. The monuments in France are in most cases sculptural concepts more than structures. There are a few chapels but most of them are not; they stand out bold against the sky as a plastic expression of a spiritual content. I think it is well to consider that.

Mr. Shepley: May I also confirm the expressions of my fellows of the Fine Arts Commission. What Mr. Delano said about it being too high seems pertinent. In looking at that illustration of the small statue and the heavy dome - even though open - I think the essence of the memorial is perhaps the statue which is there insignificant because it is covered with a dome which is much too large. I personally would like to see sunlight coming in. I have always had in mind for the Roosevelt memorial with colonnades, which I think was very beautiful, a living type of memorial. The reason I asked Mr. Pope how he would light the statue was that it brought in whether you have an open or a closed memorial. I think if you take off the dome and the pediment and add a circular ring of columns open in the center so the sunlight shines on the statue it would be more of a living memorial.

Mr. Nichols: You feel it has too many steps?

Mr. ? : I feel it is a pyramid which has no relation to the plan of Washington.

Mr. Wm. Delano: I do not quite agree with Mr. Borie that it should not be architectural. I do not think it is to be compared with the White House.

Mr. Davis: I want to reinforce that statement. It is too much to expect
I believe that such a thing is not. We all feel that way, that too
much of a good thing is bad. Mr. Kennedy's remark was to the effect that there
were other forms of memorial that were not of the memorial type, but open to
city and sunlight - something that had more substance than architecture, yet
material. It would be more of a sculptural language. The monuments in France are
in most cases sculptural language more than architecture. There are a few classical
but most of them are not; they stand out bold against the sky as a plastic
expression of a spiritual content. I think it is well to remember that.
Mr. Shepley: May I also confirm the expressions of my fellow of the
The Arts Commission. What Mr. Tolson said about it being too high seems
pertinent. In looking at that illustration of the small statue and the heavy
base - even though open - I think the essence of the memorial is perhaps the
statue which is more intelligent because it is covered with a form which is
much too large. I personally would like to see sunlight coming in. I have
always had in mind for the Roosevelt memorial with colonnades, which I think
was very beautiful, a living type of memorial. The reason I asked Mr. Tolson
now he would like the statue was that it brought in whether you have an open
or a closed memorial. I think if you take off the dome and the pediment and
add a circular form of columns open in the center as the sunlight shines on
the statue it would be more of a living memorial.
Mr. Nichols: You feel it has too many steps?
Mr. : I feel it is a pyramid which has no relation to the plan
of Washington.
Mr. Delano: I do not quite agree with Mr. Borie that it should not
be architectural. I do not think it is to be compared with the White House.

Mr. Savage: I used to see the Pantheon a good deal. I know it aesthetically. It is claimed that originally it was a round structure such as the Coliseum perhaps, and that the pediment was put on to make it a personal memorial. So there is a great deal of danger in trying to celebrate Jefferson's ideas on architecture rather than on human relations. I feel that that is rather a dreary thing as it stands. As a painter I am very much amused at the ingenuity of the American architects today. When I think of all the qualities they can bring out, I regret that this has not been exposed to the full possibility of American architects today.

Mr. Randolph: Is it not true that the Pantheon was begun in 72 B.C. and that it was later rebuilt entirely? That has nothing to do with whether it should be round or square, but it is historically correct.

Mr. Hubbard: I very probably hark back to the plan of 1901. I wonder if it would not be instructive if we had the opinion on this matter of the only surviving member of that Commission? Mr. Olmsted on July 22, 1935, wrote a memorandum report on proposed sites for a memorial to Jefferson in the National Capital. It is long and I don't read it all.

~~NOT~~ "Many studies were made of alternative plans. Some of these, in my opinion - but not in that of certain other able critics - indicated the possibility of a permanent treatment of the Washington Monument Grounds without underpinning the Monument in such a way as to produce a dignified and impressive setting for the Monument and a satisfactory coordination of the Monument Grounds with the Mall to the eastward, with the Lincoln Memorial and reflecting basin to the westward, and with the Ellipse and the White House to the northward, disregarding any possibility of a monumental development further south on the White House axis. None of these studies, and none I have since made or seen or heard about, suggest the probability that a great monumental treatment on the White House axis to the southward could be satisfactorily coordinated with the central composition without ~~the~~ such

Mr. Savage: I used to see the Pentecost a good deal. I know it

entirely. It is called that originally, it was a round, domed

such as the Coliseum perhaps, and that the Pentecost was one of the

a personal memorial. So there is a great deal of detail in trying to

celebrate Jefferson's ideas as much as the building itself. It is a

I feel that that is rather a heavy thing to be done. As a person

I am very much interested in the history of the building itself

today. When I think of all the questions they can bring out, I regret

that this has not been exposed to the full possibility of American archi-

tects today.

Mr. Hubbard: Is it not true that the building was begun in 1801?

and that it was later rebuilt entirely? That has nothing to do with

whether it should be found or not, but it is historically correct.

Mr. Hubbard: I very probably hark back to the plan of 1801. I

remember it is would not be inaccurate if we had the opinion on this

of the only surviving member of that Commission? Mr. Olmsted on July 28,

1853, wrote a memorandum report on proposed sites for a memorial to Jefferson

in the National Capital. It is long and I won't read it all.

MY "Many studies were made of alternative plans. Some of these, in
my opinion - but not in that of certain of the critics - included the
possibility of a permanent treatment of the Washington Monument Grounds
without unduly interfering with the monument in such a way as to produce a dignified
and impressive setting for the monument and a satisfactory coordination of
the Monument Grounds with the Mall to the eastward, with the Lincoln Memorial
and reflecting basin to the westward, and with the Illinois and the Ohio
Houses to the northward, disregarding any possibility of a monumental design
west of the White House axis. None of these studies, and none
I have since made or seen or heard about, suggest the possibility that a
great monumental treatment on the White House axis to the eastward could
be artistically coordinated with the central composition without any

radical regarding southwest of the Washington Monument as the engineers have found to be impracticable unless the foundations of that Monument are previously extended to rock. If that operation is ever carried out, notwithstanding the misgivings of the engineers about undertaking it - and there are many arguments for such a decision - it would make possible the execution of any plan that may be agreed upon as best, whether based closely on the plan of 1901 or radically different therefrom. The rough estimates made in 1933 for carrying out that part of the plan of 1901 embraced within the Washington Monument Grounds was of the order of seven million dollars. My personal opinion is that an appreciably smaller expenditure could be made to produce a really better result.

But, however that may be, the conditions essential to the satisfactory establishment of a memorial to Jefferson on the axis of the White House appear to me to include: (1) Extending the Washington Monument foundations to rock; (2) obtaining agreement on plans for the radical improvement of the Washington Monument Grounds in a manner properly related to a monumental development to the southward, and obtaining some millions of dollars for the execution of those plans; (3) obtaining agreement on plans and funds for their execution, providing for the radical reconstruction of an area of roughly comparable size extending southward from the Washington Monument grounds and westward from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing."

Mr. Lamb: Whose report is that?

Mr. Hubbard: Mr. Olmsted's.

Mr. Moore: I know how Mr. Olmsted feels, generally, about it. Now let's see if we can get agreement on this. The area to be included in the Jefferson Memorial - under the influence of the Jefferson Memorial - would be the area bounded by the extension of 15th and 17th streets, would it not? That is to say, an area comparable to the White House Grounds and the grounds of Lafayette Square. I mean to say that that area to be treated, utilized, and a plan made for it, should be the same area as Lafayette Square?

Mr. Hubbard: Mr. Olmsted's report referred to something very much greater than that, I should say, by this.

Mr. Moore: I am trying to get an agreement here ~~xxxxxxx~~ if I can, that 17th and 15th Streets should be carried through to the Potomac River, and that the area dominated by the Jefferson Memorial should be the area between. Is that

radical regarding southwest of the Washington Monument as the business have found to be impracticable unless the location of that monument are not- along extended to west. If that operation is ever carried out, however, standing the survivors of the survivors would be a disaster. It is not clear and many arguments for such a decision - it would be possible the execution of any plan that may be agreed upon as best, whether based closely on the plan of 1901 or radically different thereafter. The rough estimates made in 1933 for carrying out that part of the plan of 1901 showed within the Washington Monument grounds was of the order of seven million dollars. My personal opinion is that an aggressively smaller expenditure could be made to produce a really better result.

But, however that may be, the conditions essential to the early- theory establishment of a memorial to Jefferson on the site of the White House appear to me to include: (1) obtaining the Washington Monument Foundation to agree; (2) obtaining agreement on plans for the memorial improvement of the Washington Monument grounds in a manner properly related to a memorial development to the southwest, and obtaining some millions of dollars for the execution of those plans; (3) obtaining agreement on plans and funds for their execution, providing for the memorial reconstruction of an area of roughly comparable size extending southward from the Washington Monument grounds and westward from the system of existing and existing.

Mr. Lamb: Whose report is that?

Mr. Hubbard: Mr. Olmsted's.

Mr. Moore: I know how Mr. Olmsted feels, generally, about it. Now

let's see if we can get agreement on this. The area to be included in the Jefferson Memorial - under the influence of the Jefferson Memorial - would be the area bounded by the extension of 15th and 17th streets, would it not? That is to say, an area comparable to the White House grounds and the grounds of Lafayette Square. I want to say that that area to be treated, unified, and - plan made for it, should be the same area as Lafayette Square.

Mr. Hubbard: Mr. Olmsted's report referred to something very much

greater than that, I should say, by this.

Mr. Moore: I am trying to get an agreement here. I can, but 17th and 15th streets should be carried through to the Potomac River, and that area bounded by the Jefferson Memorial should be the area between. In that

true?

Mr. Hubbard: Without pledging myself that they should be carried through to the river, I should say that the area between the traces of those two streets (as shown in the plan) is roughly the area involved.

Mr. Moore: You agree that the two streets should be carried through?

Mr. Hubbard: I am not sure.

Mr. Wm. Delano: It seems to me that if you could carry them through to the river then you would have a composition.

Mr. Moore: I think there has been a great deal of trouble about handling it, making the Jefferson Memorial on a certain plot of ground inside a larger area and with the condition that the Tidal Basin is in at the present. Now, when the matter was discussed I know Major Clarke raised the question that he would like land instead of water. The 1901 plan contemplates grass there. Of course whether it cost \$10,000,000 or whether it is \$4,800,000 is a matter to be found out, but I do think Congress should know.

Mr. Cammerer: I think so too.

Mr. Wm. Delano. I think this is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl.

Mr. Moore: Now the basin was put in after the Lincoln Memorial; and Congress objected to the basin and it was not until it was called a reflecting basin that it went through. Things of that kind - but I am strongly in favor of a plan being prepared for this area.

Maj. Clarke: If you limit the site it changes the entire area south of the Monument and from 17th Street to the river. In other words by reason of making any changes in the Tidal Basin it affects the entire area. You can't plan just the area between 15th and 17th --you have to take the entire area south of the Monument.

true?

Mr. Hubbard: I think the plan is a good one.

to the river, I should say that the plan is a good one.

two streets (as shown in the plan) is roughly the area involved.

Mr. Moore: You agree that the two streets should be widened through?

Mr. Hubbard: I am not sure.

Mr. Moore: It seems to me that if you could say, "from the river"

to the river then you would have a composition.

Mr. Moore: I think there has been a great deal of trouble about

the plan, but I think the plan is a good one.

inside a larger area and also the condition that the plan is in it

the present. Now, when the matter was discussed I saw that the plan

the question that he would like land instead of water. The 1901 plan contained

plotted from 1890. It covers what is now 110,000,000 or more. It is

11,000,000 is a matter of a few acres, but I do think the plan should show.

Mr. Chamberlain: I think so too.

Mr. Mr. Deane: I think this is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl.

Mr. Moore: Now the basin was put in after the Lincoln Memorial;

and the basin was put in after the Lincoln Memorial; it was called a

reflecting basin that it went through. Things of that kind - but I am

strongly in favor of a plan being prepared for this area.

Mr. Clarke: If you limit the site it changes the entire area south

of the Monument and from 17th Street to the river. In other words by reason

of making any changes in the Tidal Basin it affects the entire area. You

can't plan just the area between 17th and 19th - you have to take the entire

area south of the Monument.

Mr. Moore: I did not mean that you wouldn't have to do that, but what I was trying to get an agreement on was that the two streets should be carried through and that the composition really begins with north of Lafayette Square and should go through to the Potomac River.

Maj. Clarke: I would not go so far as to say 15th and 17th should be carried through. I would say, at this stage of the game, that the visual axis of 15th and 17th should be carried through. Perhaps the streets could be planned some other way that would be better.

Mr. Moore: Oh surely, surely, Just theoretically, that should be the development. For instance, I think 15th would not interfere at all with the traffic highway over the bridge. It could be brought to a point where the traffic highway would be continued just as it is for the present. And 17th for the present might stop in the Monument grounds, but you must have that east and west street and the north end of the Basin must be reorganized absolutely.

Maj. Clarke: Absolutely. No question about it.

Mr. Moore: And the old B Street, Independence Avenue, has an offset after you pass the Agriculture building. That was deliberately planned in 1901 and I may say that the building which they started to build for the Agriculture went over the south road and there was the fight to keep it off the south road and leave the Mall intact. That was done. Theodore Roosevelt put the building back. By doing that you see the space is narrower on the south of the Mall than on the north and that forced the building back to the street line. On that side. It made a minor street of B Street south. You can bring it up, but not up to Constitution Avenue.

Mr. Moore: I did not mean that you wouldn't have to do that, but what I was trying to get an agreement on was that the two streets should be carried through and that the connection between them should be Lafayette Square and should go through to the former way.

Mr. Clarke: I would not go so far as to say 15th and 17th should be carried through. I would say, at this stage of the game, that the visual axis of 15th and 17th should be better preserved. It might be better planned some other way that would be better.

Mr. Moore: On purely, strictly, that should be the development. For instance, I think it would not interfere at all with the traffic along the street. It could be planned as a point across the street which would be continuous just as it is now. But 17th for the present might stop in the Monument grounds, but you must have that east and west street and the north end of the Basin must be reorganized.

Mr. Clarke: Absolutely. No question about it.

Mr. Moore: And the old B Street, Independence Avenue, has an offset after you pass the Agriculture building. That was deliberately planned in 1901 and I may say that the building which they started to build for the Agriculture went over the south road and there was the right to keep it off the south road and leave the Mall in fact. That was done. Theodore Roosevelt put the building back. By doing that you see the space is narrower on the south of the Mall than on the north and that forced the building back to the street line. On that side. It made a minor street of B Street south. You can bring it up, but not up to Constitution Avenue.

Mr. Cammerer: I think you made a very good suggestion a while ago; that we are liable to confuse objectives if we dwell on cost. That is up to the Jefferson Memorial Commission and to Congress. It is not inconceivable that Congress would raise the limit to 5 or 6 million dollars. They will get the facts. That is their job.

Mr. Randolph: As I said in my opening remarks, there are only three factors to be considered - first the American public, second the life and character of the man to be memorialized, whether Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln or who. The same principle applies. Third - adaptation. The discussion today has been on the third. I am going to express myself thuswise: That you gentlemen have come with open minds about this. I can see that. There has been criticism but no high criticism, and it is gratifying to me, as one member of a commission of 12, that there has been absolutely no feeling. We know from years of experience that these things arouse feelings. And that warps and interferes with all mental and intellectual process.

Mr. Cammerer: Thank you. I am glad you get that reaction.

Mr. Randolph. If you had made any other form of classical architecture, you men, experts in your lines of activity, would not have found fault. You would have fully expressed your minds. If you want to use the word criticism - but no high spirited criticism - constructive criticism. I am impressed with the thought that there is one problem to decide. That this Commission, created by Congress, acted wisely in selecting this site. There has been very little discussion as to the character of Jefferson, whether he was third, sixth or ninth. There is honest room for question on that. The man devoted his life to many different things. It has been debated for

Mr. Cammerer: I think you made a very good suggestion a while ago; that we are liable to confuse objectives in our minds. That is why to the Jefferson Memorial Commission and to Congress. It is an important thing that Congress would like to have a bill passed.

They will get the facts. That is their job.

Mr. Randolph: As I said in my opening remarks, there are only three factors to be considered - first the material factor, second the life and character of the man to be memorialized, Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson, Lincoln or who. The same principle applies. Third - adaptation to discussion today has been on the thing. I am going to express myself thus: That the memorial has come into your minds about this. I am sure that there has been criticism but no sign of action, and it is being - ing to me, as one member of a commission of 12, that there has been absolutely no feeling. We know from years of experience that these things arouse feelings. And that warps and interferes with all mental and intellectual process.

Mr. Cammerer: Thank you. I am glad you get that reaction.

Mr. Randolph: If you had made any other form of classical architecture, you would have fully expressed your mind. If you want to use the word criticism - but no direct criticism - constructive criticism. I am important with the thought that there is one problem to decide. That this Commission, created by Congress, acted wisely in selecting this site. There has been very little discussion as to the character of Jefferson, whether he was third, sixth or ninth. There is honest room for question on that. The man devoted his life to many different things. It has been debated for

a century. So I think you have made progress and very gratifying progress on that third element. If I am going to build a palace, being a layman, I might visualize it and be inspired for the moment to design it, and if my site was a marsh, I do not think there is a man around this table who would not say that my ideas are splendid except for the place where I was to put it. Now if it cannot be adapted to that site, that settles it. But there has been no real argument advanced that I see that the public and the man's character and life, may be affected by the location. As to the adaptation, if it is a question of the dollar mark, all right. Congress has jurisdiction over such matters, and as a layman I have had experience with such matters, and have found greatest difficulty in getting either contractors or others to agree on so many dollars. For instance within the last 60 days things have happened to raise the cost in prices of everything. Who around this table can say that that tendency has reached its maximum. Who can say that this structure, when it came to be built, would not cost twice as much? I let a contract for a building in Atlanta Georgia just before we declared war, at 40 cents an hour for labor and we paid \$1.25 less than four months later. And instead of being able to get material on the then basis, it went up ten. And we could not ship a foot of it wout special permit. So those things are important. But they are not academic. All these men can do is the best they can. Arrive at it in the best way they can, with open minds. Seek the facts. What you know today is not what you admit you know next week or next year but I am speaking to men of very advanced knowledge as well as experience and I shall not undertake to lecture to you as a professor in school. Those are the three essential things at the present to be considered.

Mr. Cammerer: We are all very much gratified that you have that reaction.

Mr. Randolph: It matters not how badly a man may comment provided he is motivated right. I came here to learn and listen. So I think you can make the punishment fit the crime if you want to, provided you have the right site. Provided you are really memorializing the man's life and character right. So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Eliot: You mean, Mr. Randolph, that the Memorial Commission would be open to suggestions from these two commissions?

Mr. Randolph: That is answered by that authority.

Mr. Eliot: Is the state of mind of your commission such that they would welcome such advice or would they resent it?

Mr. Randolph: I do not think your question is put right.

Mr. Cammerer: I know Mr. Boylan has wanted the full cooperation of both commissions. I am gratified to have your reaction to this commission and also that you could stay here and see how this commission has reacted. I do think that your commission should have and will welcome a frank, fair statement on the situation as they see it, to consider at one of its meetings. That is what these plans are here for. I think you will get that.

Mr. Nichols: It is my thought that we must get before us all the changes that I think will run - I have tried to figure - but I think whether this Commission wants some advice or not, we ought to get before them all the changes that will result from this plan and what the cost will be to the Government.

Mr. Cammerer. It is a question of fact that must be before that commission. As Executive Officer if I have those facts I will have to have those figures.

Mr. Nichols: I think there are several main things, ideas, that

Mr. Randolph: It matters not how badly a man may comment provided he is motivated right. I came here to learn and listen. So I think you can make the punishment fit the crime if you want to, provided you have the right side. Provided you are really memorializing the man's life and character right. So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Elliot: You mean, Mr. Randolph, that the Commission would be open to suggestions from these two commissions?

Mr. Randolph: That is answered by that authority.

Mr. Elliot: Is the state of mind of your commission such that they would welcome such advice or would they resent it?

Mr. Randolph: I am not sure your commission is not right.

Mr. Chairman: I know Mr. Randolph has stated his full cooperation to both commissions. I am gratified to have your reaction to this commission and also that you could stay here and see how this commission has reacted. I do think that your commission should have and will welcome a frank, fair statement on the situation as they see it, to consider at one of its meetings. That is what these plans are here for. I think you will get that.

Mr. Nichols: It is my thought that we must get before us all the changes that I think will run - I have tried to figure - but I think whether this Commission wants some advice or not, we ought to get before them all the changes that will result from this plan and what the cost will be to the Government.

Mr. Chamberlain: It is a question of fact that must be before that commission. As Executive Officer if I have those facts I will have to give them figures.

Mr. Nichols: I think there are several cases where, 1944, 1945

have not yet been included.

Mr. Moore: I understand that this meeting here is an executive session meeting and that until some decision is reached . . .

Mr. Cammerer: Mr. Delano apparently wanted to bring up the question of site again ~~his~~ in his letter here. You have heard from the Fine Arts Commission that they believe this is a site suitable for a proper memorial to Thomas Jefferson, a proper memorial. Is that the opinion of the Planning Commission?

Mr. Moore: Mr. Lamb, do you believe that this is a proper site?

(Each member of the Fine Arts Commission voted in favor of the "site")

Mr. Cammerer: How our Commission?

Col. Sultan: I think it is all right but I think we should watch ourselves on conditions. Comparing it with the Plan of 1901 I think it is a question of adaptation.

Mr. Cammerer: That is true.

Col. Sultan: As a site, I think it is all right.

Mr. Eliot: Is it "a" ~~xxx~~ proper site, or "the" proper site? There is a difference. Are you voting for this site as against all others?

Mr. Moore: The question put to us was is this "a" proper site for Jefferson.

Mr. Cammerer: The Jefferson Memorial Commission has the final selection.

Mr. Eliot: One man among many, is that your interpretation. If there are other possibilities that you vote against . . .

Mr. Moore: This is the only possibility that is up to us. Is this a proper site? May the Jefferson Memorial properly go there.

Mr. Nichols: That it is a proper site.

Mr. Nichols: That it is a proper site.

Mr. Moore: This is the only possibility that is up to us. Is this

the other possibilities that you vote against.

Mr. Eliot: I am not sure, is that your interpretation. It was

selection.

Mr. Moore: The question put to us was is this "a" proper site for

the site. The question put to us was is this "a" proper site for

Mr. Eliot: Is it "a" proper site, or "the" proper site? There is

Col. Sultan: As a site, I think it is all right.

Mr. Moore: That is true.

ourselves on conditions. Comparing it with the Plan of 1901 I think it is

Col. Sultan: I think it is all right but I think we should watch

Mr. Moore: How do you feel?

(from member of the site committee who is in favor of the site)

Mr. Moore: Mr. Lamb, do you believe that this is a proper site?

Planning Commission?

to the Commission, I am not sure, is that your opinion of the

Commission that they believe this is a site suitable for a proper memorial

or site again in the latter case. You would want the site to be

Mr. Chamber: Mr. Deane apparently wanted to bring up the question

session meeting and that until some decision is reached.

Mr. Moore: I am not sure, is that your interpretation.

have not yet been included.

Mr. Moore: Yes, "a" proper site.

Mr. Wm. Delano: I would go stronger than that, I would say "the" proper site.

Mr. Hubbard: I cannot answer yes or ~~not~~ no, for this reason: If that site is used as a memorial to Jefferson, and there is no doubt that it is "a" proper site for "a" memorial, and I am satisfied that as far as any congruity goes it is a proper site for Jefferson. If it is used properly it entails many things beyond its foundations, its immediate surroundings. It entails the question of the Tidal Basin; of the proper views to it from the Monument and across the Monument Grounds to it and on the White House axis. Before you can say that this building should be put on that site and before you can say that any building should be put on that site, you ought to know what you are getting into that will be involved in that decision. If I am voting merely as to whether (thinking of Jefferson and of the site) this is a proper place for a memorial to him I would say yes. But if the question were to be "shall this building or any appropriate building be put in that place at this time", then I could not vote yes until I knew what I was getting myself into. We have pretty well founded fears. Instead of \$3,000,000 possibly we are getting into a \$10,000,000 job and involving ourselves in an impossible engineering problem.

Mr. Cammerer: Would that apply to any site?

Mr. Hubbard: No sir. The question of size is involved in using that site, if you put a large building there. It is a proper site for a building of the right size but improper if the building is ten times as big.

Mr. Cammerer: I would assume that any building that would go there would have to be proper as to size and surroundings. Whether it is a memorial to the Constitution Makers or to Jefferson, it would have to be

memorial to the Constitution makers or to Jefferson, it would have to be
would have to be proper as to size and surroundings. Whether it is a
Mr. Gannett: I would assume that any building that would go there
of the right size but improper if the building is ten times as big.
site, if you put a large building there. It is a proper site for a building
Mr. Hubbard: No sir. The question of size is involved in using that
Mr. Gannett: Would that apply to any site?
involving ourselves in an impossible engineering problem.
instead of \$2,000,000 possibly we are getting into a \$10,000,000 job and
I knew what I was getting myself into. We have pretty well founded fears
building be put in that place at this time", then I could not vote yes until
But if the question were to be "shall this building or any appropriate
of the site) this is a proper place for a memorial to him I would say yes.
decision. If I am voting merely as to whether (thinking of Jefferson and
ought to know what you are getting into that will be involved in that
and before you can say that any building should be put on that site, you
axis. Before you can say that this building should be put on that site
the monument and across the Monument Grounds to it and on the White House
it settles the question of the right site; or the proper site as it were
it is really a question of the proper site for the memorial.
any continuity goes it is a proper site for Jefferson. If it is used proper-
it is "a" proper site for "a" memorial, and I am satisfied that as far as
that site is used as a memorial to Jefferson, and there is no doubt that
Mr. Hubbard: I cannot answer yes or ~~no~~ no, for this reason: If
proper site.

Mr. Wm. Belmont: I would go stronger than that, I would say "other"
Mr. Moore: Yes, "a" proper site.

a PROPER building.

Mr. Hubbard: If by "propriety" you mean the connection between Jefferson and the Memorial then it is proper, but if you think of propriety as being the structure in that place and its relation to its surrounding. . .

Maj. Clarke: What we are talking about is this that at the intersection of the cross axis a memorial to Thomas Jefferson would be appropriate, not knowing what kind it is. It must be appropriate to the site. I agree that it is a good place to build a memorial to Jefferson.

? of Fine Arts: Couldn't you go further and say that you think the proposed memorial is inappropriate?

Mr. Cammerer: I am doing this for Mr. Delano to ascertain the attitude. . .

Mr. Hubbard: Since that question is before us, I would like to read a little more as to Mr. Olmsted's opinion. It is only a paragraph:

"I do not want to be discouraging. I should welcome a decision of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission to take up the burden of bringing about a permanent and satisfactory improvement of the Washington Monument Grounds for the reason that it is the indispensable key to a great monumental site south of it. But frankly, I suspect that they will be unable or unwilling to delay a final decision on site as long as probably would be necessary to get this complex set of prerequisite conditions positively and satisfactorily settled."

In other words, Mr. Olmsted's opinion was that the possibility of getting things straightened out so you were sure you were doing ~~this~~ the right thing were so slight that the choice from the other possibilities was better.

Mr. Cammerer: Mr. Nichols, do you vote for it as a proper site?

Mr. Nichols: I vote for a proper site, if the traffic problems, view across the Mall, and other things can be worked out.

Mr. Cammerer: We have to assume that that can be worked out.

Mr. Hubbard: If by "propriety" you mean the connection between

Jefferson and the Memorial Hall is a proper, but it does not seem to

as being the structure in that place and its relation to its surroundings.

Mr. Clarke: What we are talking about is this that at the intersection

of the river with a memorial to Thomas Jefferson would be appropriate, not

knowing what kind it is. It must be appropriate to the site. I agree that

it is a good place to build a memorial to Jefferson.

? of Fine Arts: Couldn't you go further and say that you think the

proposed memorial is inappropriate?

Mr. Cammerer: I am doing this for Mr. Deano to ascertain the

attitude.

Mr. Hubbard: Since that question is before us, I would like to

read a little more as to Mr. Olmsted's opinion. It is only a paragraph:

"I do not want to be discouraging. I should welcome a decision

of the House of Representatives on the question of the location of the Washington Monument grounds for the reason that it is the indispensable key to a great monumental site south of it. But frankly, I suspect that they will be unable or unwilling to delay a final decision on site as long as probably would be necessary to get the site out of the hands of the committee positively and satisfactorily settled."

In other words, Mr. Olmsted's opinion was that the possibility of

settling the site question was the only way to get the site out of the hands of the committee

right thing were so slight that the choice from the other possibilities

was better.

Mr. Cammerer: Mr. Nichols, do you vote for it as a proper site?

Mr. Nichols: I vote for a proper site, if the traffic problems,

view across the Mall, and other things can be worked out.

Mr. Cammerer: We have to assume that that can be worked out.

Mr. Swmerer: Mr. Kylie, do you vote for it as a proper site?

Mr. Kylie: Yes, I vote for it as a proper site.

Mr. Nichols: Suppose you find they could not be worked out?

(The meeting recessed for luncheon at the Cosmos Club with the Fine Arts Commission, to reconvene thereafter)

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lyle, do you vote for it as a proper site?

Mr. Lyle: Yes, I vote for it as a proper site.

Mr. Nichols: Now you vote for it as a proper site?

[The meeting recessed for luncheon at the house of the site.]

[The site location, to recognize the site.]

March 20, 1937

3:56 p.m. H. Lintner.

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission reconvened at
3:55 p.m. (Commission of Fine Arts not present)

PRESENT:

Mr. Cammerer
Mr. Wm. Delano
Mr. Nichols

Mr. Hubbard
Col. Sultan
Mr. Kylie

Mr. Nichols: I just made a hasty calculation. It looks like, including what is around this treatment, this is approximately 15 acres. Certainly that 15 acres would have to be supported to bed rock. We have no assurance that Mr. Pope has considered that.

Mr. Cammerer: In this and other reports I think we should check carefully every cost included in that. Mr. Nichols brings out that not only the building but also the base and surrounding area must be on bed rock.

Mr. Nichols: Mr. Nagle should include in the study everything that is included, based on that ~~plaxxy~~ plan, which is the only thing before us now.

Mr. Cammerer: Yes.

Mr. Nichols: Any letter should tell the Chairman of the Committee what is included.

Mr. Wm. Delano: Is it any of our business?

Mr. Nichols: I think it is. If they spend \$3,000,000, what assurance is there that they will give you the rest that is needed?

Mr. Wm. Delano: Well, I think we ought to call attention to it.

Col. Sultan: Put it this way, that we will not approve it unless Mr. Cammerer will assure us we will get the money, or unless Congress assures him it will give him the money.

Mr. Cammerer: Those facts are necessary. If you were sitting on

March 20, 1937

3:55 p.m. H. Lintner.

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission reconvened at

3:55 p.m. (Commission of Fine Arts not present)

Col. Giffen
Mr. Wylie

Mr. Wm. Delano
Mr. Nichols

Mr. Nichols: I just made a hasty calculation. It looks like,

including what is around this treatment, this is approximately 15 acres.

Certainly that 15 acres would have to be supported to bed rock. We have

no assurance that Mr. Pope has considered that.

Mr. Gummer: In this and other reports I think we should check

carefully every cost included in that. Mr. Nichols brings out that not

only the building but also the base and surrounding area must be on bed rock.

Mr. Nichols: Mr. Nagle should include in the study everything that

is included, based on that ~~study~~ plan, which is the only thing before us now.

Mr. Gummer: Yes.

Mr. Nichols: My letter should tell the Chairman of the Committee

what is included.

Mr. Wm. Delano: Is it any of our business?

Mr. Nichols: I think it is. If they spend \$5,000,000, what assurance

is there that they will give you the rest that is needed?

Mr. Wm. Delano: Well, I think we ought to call attention to it.

Col. Giffen: But in this way, that we will not approve it unless

Mr. Gummer will assure us we will get the money, or unless Congress assumes

that it will give him the money.

Mr. Gummer: Those facts are necessary. If you were sitting on

that Commission you would want those facts, and so would I. Now ~~ex~~
 we are working for an expression. At this time, I am sure there is time, those
 members should be stirred into checking on those facts so the whole picture
 may be before them. I think we have to get these facts at that time. I will
 bring it before that Commission myself.

Mr. Nichols: It is our duty to point out how to solve the planning
 problems we will be confronted with if this structure goes in.

Mr. Cammerer: Will you tend to that Mr. Nagle?

Mr. Nagle: Yes.

Mr. Cammerer: I find it takes two or three days to check details
 like this. We have tried to do it in one meeting. So whatever letter we will
 draw up on the basis of this must be on the basis of the record. Let Mr. Delano
 sign it and maybe Mr. Hubbard and others will help on it. Let's get
 off a few of these other things. Then come back to the Memorial.

that Commission you would want those facts, and so would I. Now

we are working for an expression. At this time, I am sure there is time, those

members should be stirred into checking on those facts so the whole picture

may be better than I think we have at present. I will

bring it before that Commission myself.

Mr. Nichols: It is our duty to point out how to solve the planning

problem we will be confronted with in all our work.

Mr. Nichols: Will you kindly be seated.

Mr. Nichols: Yes.

Mr. Nichols: I find it takes two or three days to check details

like this. We have tried to do it in one meeting. So whatever letter we will

draw up on the basis of this must be on the basis of the record. Let Mr. Nelson

sign it and maybe Mr. Hubbard and others will help on it. Let's get

off a few of these other things. Then come back to the Memorial.

Thomas Jefferson Memorial: (See also Pars. _____)

Mr. Hubbard: This may not be what you want.

"The National Capital Park and Planning Commission has carefully considered the plans for the location and character of the proposed memorial to Thomas Jefferson as put before us and today explained by Mr. J. M. Pope and others.

"We have reached the following conclusions: (1) The site is one of a very few now available which is of a dignity and importance suitable for a structure of a character proper as a memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

(2) The character and size of such a memorial in this place should, however, be determined not only by its fitness as an expression of the character of Jefferson but also by its fitness as a monumental structure related to the Capitol, the Lincoln Memorial, the White House and the Washington Monument in the great composition of the Mall and the north-and-south axis of the White House.

(3) Furthermore, even though it should fulfill all the above requirements, it must also be so designed and so placed that it does not entail too great an expense and destruction of existing utility and beauty in the adaptation of its surroundings and the changes which it necessitates. It should not greatly interrupt or divert important traffic; should not prevent the functioning of the Tidal Basin; and ~~it~~ should not greatly diminish existing recreational facilities and opportunities.

(4) Finally, the cost of the structure and the changes which it entails should be reasonable in relation to their purpose.

"Having the above considerations in mind, we are (unanimously) of the opinion that the plans submitted call for structures and changes out of proportion to the purposes which they serve. The building, with its terraces, would overshadow the Lincoln Memorial and its setting in effect by sheer appearance of bulk. It would produce an unpleasant arrangement of three lagoons, two formal and one half informal, which could only at great expense serve the practical purposes of the present Tidal Basin. It would take _____ acres from the present south Potomac Park. It would destroy the existing cherry trees and many scores of thrifty elms. As to cost the present figure of \$5,000,000 authorized by Congress would construct only the building and its immediate surroundings. To effect the changes to which the Government would be in effect committed by this first expenditure would, in our opinion, necessitate a further cost of many millions more.

"We therefore believe that, before funds are appropriated for any construction for this purpose on this site, plans and estimates should be before Congress which are less grandiose than the present plans, more satisfactory to those who are responsibly concerned with the final result, and which are accompanied by reliable figures as to the total expense to which the Government would be committed."

"The National Capital Park and Planning Commission has carefully considered the plans for the location and character of the proposed memorial to Thomas Jefferson as put before us and today explained by Mr. J. A. Pope and others.

"We have reached the following conclusions: (1) The site is one of a very few now available which is of a dignity and importance suitable for a structure of a character proper as a memorial to Thomas Jefferson. (2) The character and site of such a memorial in this place should, however, be determined not only by its fitness as an expression of the character of Jefferson but also by its fitness as a monumental structure related to the Capitol, the Lincoln Memorial, the White House and the Washington Monument in the great composition of the Mall and the north-and-south axis of the White House.

(3) Furthermore, even though it should fulfill all the above requirements, it must also be so designed and so placed that it does not entail too great an expense and destruction of existing utility and beauty in the neighborhood of the memorial. It should not greatly interrupt or divert important traffic; should not prevent the functioning of the Mall; and should not create any other undesirable conditions. (4) Finally, the cost of the memorial and the memorial grounds should be reasonable in relation to their purpose.

"Having the above considerations in mind, we are (unanimously) of the opinion that the plans submitted call for structures and changes out of proportion to the purposes which they serve. The building, with its terraces, would overshadow the Lincoln Memorial and its setting in effect by sheer appearance of bulk. It would produce an unpleasant arrangement of three lagoons, two formal and one half informal, which could only at great expense serve the practical purposes of the present tidal basin. It would take acres from the present South Potomac Park. It would destroy the existing cherry trees and many acres of thirty class. As to cost the present figure of \$5,000,000 authorized by Congress would be too small only the building and its immediate surroundings. To effect the changes to which the Government would be in effect committed by this first expenditure would, in our opinion, necessitate a further cost of many millions more.

"We therefore believe that before funds are appropriated for any construction for this purpose on this site, plans and estimates should be before Congress which are less grandiose than the present plans, more satisfactory to those who are responsibly concerned with the final result, and which the Government would be committed to.

Mr. Nichols: You say the \$3,000,000 includes the structure and its immediate surroundings. I think it should say "a small part of the immediate surroundings."

Mr. Hubbard: O yes, yes.

Mr. Nichols: The structure proper is only a small part of the terraces. I wonder if we should say we feel there should be further study by the engineers as to whether the Tidal Basin rearrangement will prove practical for washing out the Washington Channel.

Mr. Hubbard: That is one of the many things which should accompany the request for money before they get it. They should know what they are getting into.

Mr. Nichols: No engineer I have talked with will say that this rearrangement will clean the channel.

Col. Sultan: That is true. And certainly, no Government engineer has indicated what the cost will be. We have only the most informal estimates.

Mr. Nagle: And there are no limits to the project.

Mr. Nichols: If by putting this here and rearranging the Basin you cannot keep the channel clean that is a good reason for not letting this go here.

Mr. Hubbard: This is full of dynamite and this is just the first draft. We should be careful in wording it.

Col. Sultan: Did you stress enough the loss of the recreation features and the substitution of a cold-blooded memorial? The polo field, for example, and other facilities will be lost. All you get is a formal memorial.

Nichols: You say the \$8,000,000 includes the structure and its immediate surroundings. I think it should say "a small part of the immediate surroundings."

Mr. Hubbard: Yes, yes.

Mr. Nichols: The structure proper is only a small part of the terraces. I wonder if we should say we feel there should be further study by the engineers as to whether the Tidal Basin rearrangement will prove practical for washing out the Washington Channel.

Mr. Hubbard: That is one of the many things which should accompany the request for money before they get it. They should know what they are

getting into.

Mr. Nichols: No engineer I have talked with will say that this

rearrangement will clean the channel.

Col. Sulist: That is true. And certainly no Government engineer

has indicated what the cost will be. We have only the most informal estimates.

Mr. Nagle: And there are no limits to the project.

Mr. Nichols: If by putting this here and rearranging the Basin you

cannot keep the channel clean that is a good reason for not leaving this

as it is.

Mr. Hubbard: This is full of dynamite and this is just the first

draft. We should be careful in wording it.

Col. Sulist: Did you stress enough the loss of the recreation

features and the substitution of a cold-blooded memorial? The polo

field, for example, and other facilities will be lost. All you get is a

stone memorial.

(H. R. 12027)

Mr. Cammerer: That is the point I wanted to bring out. This site has always been pointed out as a satisfactory site for a proper memorial of large proportions. That word "proper" means proper in every ways - treatment of grounds and everything. All our plans from 1901 to date indicate that that is such a site, and its use would involve the sacrifice of the things you mention.

Mr. Hubbard: Would you like to have this typed with copies for each of us? I was afraid of that, Mr. Cammerer.

Mr. Cammerer: I think it would help to have copies "Satisfactory to those who are responsibly concerned with the final result", you say. Can't we say "We are the ones responsible for the final result"?

Mr. Hubbard: Yes. In spite of the law, you have to administer this and the City of Washington must live with it forever and ever.

Mr. Cammerer: Say - "more satisfactory to the public in the final result".

Col. Sultan: "the public and the future plan of Washington."

Mr. Hubbard: All right.

Mr. Nichols: I think you want to get in something to the effect that we recommend that no further steps be taken until the engineers have made further study and include study of the interlocking. . .

Approved, June 3, 1935.

(The stenographer, at this point, was sent out to make copies of Mr. Hubbard's draft of the motion)

Mr. Nicholas: You say the \$1,000,000 includes the \$500,000 for the

Mr. Cammerer: That is the point I wanted to bring out. This

site has always been pointed out as a satisfactory site for a proper memorial

of large proportions. That word "proper" means proper in every way - treat-

ment of grounds and everything. All our plans from 1901 to date indicate

that that is such a site, and its use would involve the sacrifice of the

things you mention.

Mr. Hubbard: Would you like to have this typed with copies for

each of us? I was afraid of that, Mr. Cammerer.

Mr. Cammerer: I think it would help to have copies "Satisfactory

to those who are responsibly concerned with the final result", you say. Can't

we say "We are the ones responsible for the final result"?

Mr. Hubbard: Yes. In spite of the law, you have to administer

this and the City of Washington must live with it forever and ever.

Mr. Cammerer: Say - "more satisfactory to the public" in the

final result".

Col. Sultan: "the public and the future plan of Washington."

Mr. Hubbard: All right.

Mr. Nicholas: I think you want to get in something to the effect

that we recommend that no further steps be taken until the engineers have made

further study and include study of the interlocking. . .

Col. Sultan: Did you stress enough the fact that the stenographer, at this point, was sent out to make copies

of Mr. Hubbard's draft of the motion?

(H. R. 12027)

To authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Thomas Jefferson

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), heretofore created for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for designing and constructing a permanent memorial in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, shall determine upon a plan and design for, and proceed with the construction of, such memorial upon a site selected by the Commission, under a contract or contracts hereby authorized to be entered into in a total sum not exceeding \$3,000,000.

SEC. 2. In the execution of its functions the Commission--

(a) May designate as its executive agent any officer, agency, or establishment of the Federal Government qualified and equipped to act in that capacity, and any such officer, agency, or establishment so designated is authorized to act as such agent.

(b) May avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission of Fine Arts shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

(c) May make expenditures for personal services without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the purchase or preparation of plans, designs, and estimates, printing and binding, office equipment and supplies, contract stenographic reporting service, books and periodicals, traveling expenses of members and employees of the Commission (including such expenses and allowances for members of the Commission when required to be in Washington, District of Columbia, in connection with the work of the Commission), and such other contingent and miscellaneous expenses as may be necessary: Provided, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Commission under authority of this subsection.

Approved, June 3, 1936.

(H. R. 12027)

To authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Thomas Jefferson

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), heretofore created for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for designing and constructing a permanent memorial in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, shall determine upon a plan and design for, and proceed with the construction of, such memorial upon a site selected by the Commission, under a contract or contracts hereby authorized to be entered into in a total sum not exceeding \$3,000,000.

SEC. 2. In the execution of its functions the Commission--

(a) May designate as its executive agent any officer, agency, or establishment of the Federal Government qualified and equipped to act in that capacity, and any such officer, agency, or establishment so designated is authorized to act as such agent.

(b) May avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission of Fine Arts shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

(c) May make expenditures for personal services without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the purchase or preparation of plans, designs, and estimates, printing and binding, office equipment and supplies, contract stenographic reporting service, books and periodicals, traveling expenses of members and employees of the Commission (including such expenses and allowances for members of the Commission when required to be in Washington, District of Columbia, in connection with the work of the Commission), and such other contingent and miscellaneous expenses as may be necessary: Provided, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Commission under authority of this subsection.

Approved, June 3, 1936.